

NOTICE TO READER
When you finish reading this magazine, place a 1-cent stamp on this notice, mail the magazine, and it will be placed in the hands of our soldiers or sailors destined to proceed overseas. No wrapping—no address.
A. S. BURLESON, Postmaster-General.

THE AMERICAN ✱ CHURCH ✱ MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D. D., Editor

July, 1918

20 Cents

The Fundamental Principles of the World War	351
<i>The Rev. J. G. Hammaršköld, D.D.</i>	
Religion and the Church After the War	362
<i>The Rev. Hamilton Schuyler</i>	
The Religious Use of the Imagination	369
<i>The Right Rev. Charles Fiske, D.D.</i>	
Restoring the Balance	382
<i>The Very Rev. Frank L. Vernon, D.D.</i>	
The Cheer Up Philosophy	388
<i>The Rev. Henry S. Whitehead, M.A.</i>	
The Heart of Our Religion	394
<i>Chauncy Brewster Tinker, Ph.D.</i>	
The Indispensableness of Bible Study	401
<i>The Rev. Fleming James, Ph.D.</i>	
The Russian Sects	416
<i>Clarence A. Manning, Ph.D.</i>	
Editorial Comment	423
Book Reviews	429

Entered as second-class matter May 10, 1917, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under Act of March 3, 1879

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager

11 West 45th Street

NEW YORK

Third Edition, revised and enlarged.

VINDICATION OF ANGLICAN ORDERS.

By the late **ARTHUR LOWNDES, D.D.**

Two volumes. 8 vo. Cloth. Copious Index.

950 pp. \$5.00 net.

This work had the unique honor paid to it of being commended to the Universal Episcopate in an Encyclical signed by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Littlejohn, Bishop of Long Island, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Seymour, Bishop of Springfield, and the Rt. Rev. Dr. Coleman, Bishop of Delaware.

The Great War, when it ends, will bring the world face to face with many problems calling for a solution. The most insistent of these problems will be the religious ones.

From writers from every front, we hear that religious experiences never pressed the consciences of the soldiers as they have in this war.

Prejudices begotten of ignorance have melted away. English soldiers seeing roadside crosses in France are asking for their re-erection in the lanes and byways of England. When the war is over the men now at the front will be asking for the reasons of a divided Christendom. Should the Allies win, the fate of Austria will be in the balance. Austria is now the only Papal country in Europe. The claims of the Pope will call for more careful examination than ever.

Dr. Lowndes' great work is acknowledged to be the most convincing and scholarly presentation of the Anglican side of the controversy between Rome and ourselves on the question of Anglican Orders.

Another great value of the Vindication is that it is known and highly valued by Eastern Theologians, as is shown by Archbishop Nicolai's commendation, as also by the fact that in the semi-official pamphlet on "the Validity of Anglican Orders from the Orthodox Standpoint," by Professor Androutsos, it is extensively quoted.

Edwin S. Gorham, *Publisher*

New York

Allied and American Peace Terms

By SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Semitic Languages in the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, and Editor of the Journal of the Society of Oriental Research. Cloth, 60 cents. Postage, about 5 cents.

We must win the war first. But we must not wait for it to be won before we consider what comes next. The fate of races, peoples, and groups will depend upon the terms of the treaty of peace. To be able to deal intelligently with them, America and the Allies must learn what group units have the elements of nationality in themselves and what have not. This is the subject of Professor Mercer's inquiry.

He evinces a thorough knowledge of the many separate groups in the Balkans and elsewhere. What are the race affinities and prejudices of each of these? Statesmen must know before they can deal intelligently with the issues that come after the war; and when the war is over it will be too late to begin to learn.

Just Issued

The Place of the Laity in the Church

By W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, G. BAYFIELD ROBERTS, GORDON CROSSE, N. P. WILLIAMS. Price, \$1.15. Postage, about 12 cents.

The newest addition to the Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice. Treats of the subject historically and practically.

Published by

The Young Churchman Co.
Milwaukee, Wis.

SEVENTH THOUSAND

THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH AND THE BEAUTY OF HOLINESS. By Rev. J. A. Regester, S.T.D. Small 12mo. 124 pages. Cloth, 50c. net; paper, 25c. net.

"We can without reservation recommend the careful treatment of Church Ritual and kindred subjects we find in 'The Worship of the Church.' Teaching given along the lines of Dr. Regester's book would do a great deal to attract people by giving them the plain information about all of those matters which might otherwise only confuse and disturb their minds."—*The Churchman*.

"We commend this little book very highly to the clergy and others."—*The Living Church*.

"'The Worship of the Church' is a book of useful information."—*Church Review* (English).

"'The Worship of the Church and the Beauty of Holiness' is a wonderfully satisfactory little manual of definitions and explanations of symbolism, ornaments, pious customs and ritual."—*The Angelus*.

"This is one of the best little manuals that has ever come to our attention."—*The Church Eclectic*.

"The clergy will find this excellent work well suited as a gift to members of confirmation classes, and also a valuable manual for the higher classes in parish and Sunday schools.

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Publisher

Contributors and Contents for July

The Rev. J. G. Hammarasköld is the Rector of S. Johannes' Church, Yonkers, N. Y. His essay on "The Fundamental Principles of the World War" was read before the New York Clericus, and he has kindly consented to have it published in this magazine without the latter part, which dealt with somewhat abstruse philosophical questions. It is very interesting to see the war from the standpoint of a Swedish scholar so widely read in German and Swedish literature as Dr. Hammarasköld. The essay is being privately printed by the author as a pamphlet for general distribution.

The Rev. Hamilton Schuyler, the Rector of Trinity Church, Trenton, N. J., discusses various problems connected with "Religion and the Church after the War." However long the war may continue, it is certainly the part of wisdom for us to be foresighted enough to consider what reforms may be necessary to meet conditions in the new era.

The Right Rev. Dr. Fiske, the Bishop-Coadjutor of Central New York, contributes an article on "The Religious Use of the Imagination." This was read as a paper at a conference of the clergy and is printed from notes made at the time. It has not been possible therefore to free it from the direct personal tone of the spoken address.

The Very Rev. Frank L. Vernon is Dean of S. Luke's Cathedral, Portland, Maine. His article on "Restoring the Balance" is an appeal for the completion of the Reformation by bringing back Adoration and Sacrifice to their rightful place in the devotional system of the Church.

The Rev. Henry S. Whitehead, of the staff of the Church of S. Mary the Virgin, New York, contributes a breezy criticism of "The Cheer Up Philosophy," which ought to prove easy reading for a hot summer afternoon.

Prof. Chauncey Brewster Tinker, of Yale University, is already familiar to our readers. "The Heart of Our Religion" was an address delivered at the Annual Conference of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament in New York City on May 30, 1918. It is printed from a stenographic report.

The Rev. Fleming James is the Rector of S. Paul's Church, Englewood, N. J. In his article on "The Indispensableness of Bible Study," he makes a scholarly appeal for greater familiarity with the sacred Scriptures on the part of both clergy and laity.

Clarence A. Manning is Lecturer in Slavonic Languages in Columbia University. His article on "The Russian Sects" is a timely description of the extraordinary heretical and almost non-Christian sects that could exist nowhere in the world but in Russia. It gives a clear insight into the workings of the Russian mind, and may help to dissipate the impression that the Eastern Church has been completely dead for centuries.

The American Church Monthly

*A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing
with questions confronting the Anglican Communion
and more especially the Church in the United States*

Volume III

JULY, 1918

Number 5

Fundamental Principles of the World-War*

BY THE REV. J. G. HAMMARSKÖLD, D.D.

IN summarizing his thoughts and writings on the present war, the distinguished Danish critic, George Brandes, exclaims,—“The whole war is without meaning.” Many other well-known writers have reached the same conclusion. Such a conclusion is the result of hopelessness and mental color-blindness. It shows that these writers have not found a synthetic view-point from which to survey the problems involved.

It is no longer a difficult task to find such a view-point, if one takes the trouble to examine the principles most widely proclaimed and accepted. Of these principles only two stand out as distinctly fundamental.

One of them is the principle of *absolutism*. The other has not yet received a universally recognized name, but for our purpose it will suffice to call it *federalism*.

Both of these principles lead to the same goal, and this goal is *world-unity*. Here we have the synthetic view-point, the key to the actual situation.

It is now evident that in this war the world's unity has become the most important thing. And this *world-unity* is usually explained by the term, *world-state*.

* The related facts have been gathered from various sources, but chiefly from essays of leading Swedish and German writers.

In the last analysis, the *world-state* is the goal of the present war. During its progress the *world-state* has risen into the realm of consciousness of mankind and become a *reality* which henceforth must be considered by all statesmen and rulers.

It has been accepted as the ultimate aim of the practical politics of nations, and as soon as the war ends, statesmen will begin to construct it in a deliberate and uncompromising manner. It is evident that this reconstruction or transformation means death to the political and social order existing before the war.

The fact that world-unity or the world-state has risen into the consciousness of mankind must necessarily be our synthetic view-point, because this fact has demonstrated that the ancient political dream of struggling humanity has at last been fulfilled.

History bears testimony to the fact that the realization of this dream of world-unity has ever been one of the highest ambitions of mankind. We find it in the Old Testament and in the political aspirations of antiquity. The aim was to conquer the then known world, and to bind its many parts into one organic whole. What Alexander the Great, what the Holy Roman Empire, and what Napoleon at a later date sought to realize, that is what our present generation is called upon to bring about.

The war has demonstrated the necessity of the unification of the world. That appears today to be unavoidable. Of this men are persuaded. But when it comes to the question, what form the world-state shall take, the conceptions of men differ most radically. It is for the settlement of this question that the opposing camps are engaged in a life and death struggle.

In this struggle the conception of the absolutistic world-state is represented by Germany.

In taking this stand Germany represents the oldest political traditions of the world. She considers herself chosen by God to realize these traditions, and to rule the world. She applies to herself God's promise to His people,—“In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.” The Kaiser's public utter-

ances show that he earnestly believes God has chosen him to be His representative on earth. In defending this position German writers have reminded us of what has taken place in the past. Alexander the Great was looked upon as the darling of the gods. The Romans considered themselves the peculiarly privileged people. So did the Assyrians in their day. Germano-Roman emperors were the instruments of God. Some people acclaimed Napoleon as the chosen standard-bearer of civilization to all the nations of the earth.

But the Germany of today has taken a further step, the last step any champion of absolutism can ever take. She has chosen in the most deliberate fashion to fight for the attainment of world-dominion, the subjugation of the whole race.

It is this fact that is often forgotten or misunderstood. Some believe that Germany is merely striving to obtain a wider market for her commerce or to out-rival England. But if the fact that Germany strives for world-dominion is lost sight of, it is impossible to understand what the war is about.

That a world-dominion encircling the entire globe has been Germany's aim ought to be perfectly clear to all who consider what has taken place in European politics since 1878. That year Germany took the first step in the direction of world-dominion. The Balkan question was settled at the Berlin Congress. By her victories over Austria and France, Germany had destroyed the balance of power created at the Vienna Congress in 1815. By the alliance with Austria in 1875 and with Italy in 1882, Germany isolated France and laid the military foundation for further advance in the chosen direction.

So far the would-be world-conqueror had depended exclusively on the army. But, with the attainment of hegemony in Europe, the next step was to secure world hegemony. For this purpose a gigantic naval policy was inaugurated. This policy coincided with the ascension of William II to the imperial throne. His first proclamation concerning the aim of his government's foreign policy contained this significant statement,—“Hereafter nothing shall be decided in the world without the consent of Germany.” According to a German authority

"this means that no decision shall be allowed in the world, unless Germany has dictated its contents."

The immediate result of this world-grasping absolutism was the colossal naval program of 1888, 1900 and 1902. Great and speedy progress followed. Gradually the purpose of the absolutistic policy became clearer to the German people. When the duped European nations at last began to wake up, and the former leading states, England and France, entered into a preparatory alliance (1904), Germany at once stamped this as an illegitimate infringement of her rights to world dominion. From this time on Germany has played an open game. On March 31st, 1905, only a few weeks after Russia's defeat at Mukden, the German Emperor visited Tangier and interfered directly in the Moroccan situation by ordering an ultimatum sent to France, thus forcing the French Minister of Foreign Affairs to resign. By this time the military position of Germany had become paramount. When she none the less suffered a political defeat at the Algeiras conference in 1906, she perceived that an antagonistic world necessitated a still stronger demonstration of power. Therefore the naval program was still further extended in 1906 and 1908. Shortly after Francis Joseph had announced on October 5th, 1908, the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Germany threw down the gauntlet to opposing powers by violating treaties and encouraging Austria to ignore the sacred rights of other nations.

Germany's deliberate attitude on this occasion was calculated to show the world that the political balance of Europe had come to an end. Now there was only one power that could boast of being the arbiter in world politics, and that power was Germany. Two years later, during the Agadir crisis, a second attempt of the same kind was made, but then it miscarried. This miscarriage was the means of throwing the clearest light on the extent to which the idea of world-dominion had permeated the German nation. The whole country was aroused. The coveted world hegemony was threatened, and in 1912 and 1913 Germany made her next move in the game by executing, on a far vaster scale than ever before,

another army and navy program. Then, since it had become even more apparent that the other powers were not inclined to bow to the would-be world-conqueror, Germany deemed it absolutely necessary to resort to arms. It was to be "Weltmacht oder Niedergang" as the slogan had it. Thus the world-war was forced on mankind.

Maximilian Harden admitted this in *Die Zukunft* for October 17, 1914, in the following statement: "It is *not against our own will* that we have committed ourselves to this tremendous adventure. We have not been forced into it by surprise. *We willed it*—we had to will it. Mighty Germany does not propose to appear before the tribunal of Europe; we recognize no such tribunal. Our growth in power will create new laws for Europe. *It is Germany who strikes*. Germany wages the war in the unshakeable conviction that what she has accomplished entitles her to a *more prominent place in the world* and more elbow-room for her activities. . . . Now Germany's hour has struck, and she must take up her dominant position in the world."

Those who see nothing but a gross materialism in this German world policy misunderstand the whole problem. It is not true that this policy is simply an outburst of moral and intellectual barbarism on the part of the German nation. All who are familiar with modern German readily concede the wonderful efficiency and high intellectual development of the German people. The only explanation is that Germany is the spokesman for, as well as the guardian of, the old world-grabbing absolutism. Her world-conception is transparent and clear, for Germany has been the first power to realize fully the imminence of the coming world-state as the result of the widespread modern appreciation of the unity of the race. Her avowed purpose is the benefit of humanity. Her stated intention is to build the peace of the world upon the foundation of her own military power and the protection it is considered to afford.

But in assuming this attitude Germany has committed an unpardonable blunder. She has been looking to the past instead of reaching out into the future for her ideals. By staring at

antiquity she has become petrified as a political body. Modern Germany has carried political absolutism to a point where its impossibility is patent to the rest of the world, and her dissolution is unavoidable.

The motives behind Germany's fight to establish the world-state on the foundation of political absolutism are without doubt idealistic. All German utterances show this. Already a hundred years ago Fichte proclaimed the German people to be the chosen people, the great pedagogical people, whose task it was to give all other nations the nurture productive of intellectual and spiritual life. Ordinary Germans suppose that this mission is analogous to that of Israel, to bring blessings to the nations of the world. Even in these days a "Bedenken," signed by learned professors and leading clergymen, contains these assertions,—"Divine Providence has appointed the German people to be the salt and the light of the world, to undertake the guidance of other nations, and to purify humanity of its inherent evil." . . . "The mission of our Fatherland is to destroy what is not of God, and to reconstruct and ennoble the world in accordance with His revelation."

In these and numerous other carefully prepared statements we have the ancient world-policy of absolutism expressed as clearly as can be desired.

This notion that Germany is the chosen country has become the matrix of a grand, world-encircling activity of the most practical nature. This activity partly has its roots in German thought, and partly reacts upon it. As expressed in the colossal armaments, it shows how the German world-state has been no idle dream, but a reality on the march.

When the war broke out German business men had already encircled the globe with a net-work of steamship lines and commercial establishments. They had also acquired a controlling interest in numerous industries, not only in European countries, but also in the United States, Central and South America, China, India and Africa. A group of German bankers controlled Australia's output of zinc and lead, thus making it possible for Germany to dominate a large part of the world's metal

supply. German corporations had complete control of Turkey's largest and most important railroad systems. The colonies Germany had acquired in Africa and the Pacific cover an area of 2,658,548 square kilometers, more than five times the size of the German Empire in Europe. Thus she already possessed ample room for her overflowing population and a market for her growing industry. These facts indicate what Germany has been able to accomplish within the last fifty years by viewing the world as a unit. All the time the purpose has been to build the world-state according to German ideas. With this in view, the whole gigantic task has been undertaken. The thought of final victory has given to all efforts a religious character.

According to German conception, humanity is essentially evil. Men are nothing but wild animals who do not know what is best for them. Against these wild animals, dispersed throughout the world, there stands in each country the king, with authority direct from God, to rule these creatures and to force them into a community founded upon divine revelation. In this way humanity is to be saved by the monarchs of the world. But Germany has seen how the monarchical principle is daily becoming weaker and weaker, how even kings degenerate, and how—as a consequence—humanity deteriorates more and more. Therefore Germany is destined to save humanity from disintegration. The means for effecting this glorious task is the establishment of a world-state with the German monarchy as its foundation. All this is in perfect harmony with the Kaiser's own words at his coronation: "Hereafter nothing shall be decided in the world without first consulting Germany and the German Emperor. There is only one master in Germany, and that one is I, and I am not going to tolerate any other."

This absolutistic doctrine has moulded the whole political life of Germany. It led Bismarck to make the following statement in the Prussian Assembly on March 22nd, 1849:

"The strife of principles which during this year has shaken Europe to its foundations is one in which no compromise is possible. They rest on opposite bases. The one

draws its law from what is called the will of the people, in truth, however, from the law of the strongest on the barricades. The other rests on authority created by God, on authority by the grace of God. . . . The decision on these principles will not come by parliamentary debate, not by majority of votes, sooner or later the God who directs the battle will cast His iron dice."

As humanity in its present condition cannot be trusted, it is necessary to uproot the evil that holds it captive, *i. e.*, its laws, liberties, rights, languages. German Kultur must be substituted, and all men, as members of the world-state, ought to have only three privileges conferred upon them,—to pay taxes, do military duty and obey orders.

On this foundation, from a German view-point, the most idealistic ever proclaimed in history, the new world-state was to be established.

Opposed to this German conception of how the coming world-state ought to be politically formed stands the federalistic principle, in this war represented by England, France and the United States. Federalism is a continuation of a tradition that extends back no farther than to the beginning of modern times. The middle ages constituted a period of fixed systems, and their sustaining force was the cosmopolitan idea. But this idea was forced to the background by the dismemberment of the world, as then known, through geographical discoveries. The Old World ceased to be the center; and the whole period from the end of the middle ages to the present day is characterized by a tendency to draw in the new continents within the boundaries of the old. The world policy of this period was dominated by the idea of political equilibrium, and the grouping of various states with a view of sustaining this equilibrium.

It is obvious that there is an entirely new conception of life at work behind this movement. The mercantile states, headed by England, foster the new idea. This means that the old life principle of war is threatened by the new principle of commerce, and as peace is a necessary pre-requisite for commerce, peace has become the leading principle in the policy of equilibrium.

The conception of the world as a single, enormous market has gradually become pre-eminent. Various states assume the rôle of mercantile houses. Any one disturbing the peace of this market is considered as a disorderly person on an equality with a drunkard entering the marketplace. Security in the world-market is insured by means of treaties and understandings, and the indispensable foundation for its continuance consists in faithful adherence to their provisions.

What has taken place in the world since the middle ages is simply this: the foundation has been continually strengthened; the treaties and agreements have been made more binding as well as more comprehensive; the market has been extended, on these foundations, over larger and larger parts of the globe, and the essential elements of these foundations have been ideally termed Civilization. This slowly growing world-state has been, in the most eminent degree, a Civic World State in contradistinction to the military state of absolutism.

By tracing the development of this federalistic policy one soon finds wherein it differs from the world policy of absolutism. The latter has always, like Napoleon, and, in these days, Germany, looked upon the world and humanity from a mechanical point of view. It has viewed both as inanimate things which may be grouped like so many toy blocks with which children build forts. This view is a residue of the antiquated conception of political slavery.

Federalism, on the other hand, considers organic life, its forms and conditions. It does not begin with the world-state as a pre-requisite, mechanically planned, but with the world-state as a goal, as the point towards which all movements in the world converge, as the end, or perhaps rather the focus of, world politics, for, even when the world-state is realized, there will still be need of politics.

During the 400 years that have elapsed since federalism began its peaceful progress, the world's unity has in many ways become a fact. Exploring expeditions have prepared the way of commerce. Commerce has opened the boundaries of isolated countries and tied strong bonds between the nations.

In the wake of commerce has followed what in the history of mankind has always been the constructive and cohesive force, namely law, and different peoples have learned to know and respect one another instead of hating and murdering one another.

But more than this. The world has slowly but surely become transformed from many to *one* single community. The different countries have exchanged their goods and their food products. One nation has received grain from the other, and given coal and iron in exchange, and thus one country has come to be dependent upon another. For the merchant, the banker, the inventor, the scientist and the artist, all political boundaries have vanished. Steamships, railroads, telegraphs, and the industrial revolution of the 19th Century have served as means of uniting the human race and changing the whole world into *one* single locality. Behind the life of modern humanity lies this fact. The world is one gigantic *economic community*, and the basis of this community is peace.

And now, like Napoleon in former days, comes Germany upon the scene, a disturber of the peace, a rioter, which must therefore naturally appear to all advocates of the federalistic principle as a barbarian state, a spectre of the past, and as a decided menace to the whole world community, inasmuch as it has declared the very foundation of this community false and reasserted that war is the only real foundation.

With that it has become manifest to believers in federalism that the contest concerns which principle should be the governing one in the world. Is it to be the modern one that has shaped democracy, or is the one that represents the warlike traditions of antiquity and the middle ages to prevail in the shaping of the world's future? The situation has become entirely changed, for the war is waged for principle, and for the first time in history the mightiest powers are found deliberately fighting to establish *world peace* as the universal rule for the politics of the whole world.

There may be some ground for holding the opinion that the responsibility for this war in a way rests on the champions

of federalism, because they represented the strongest nations, and at the same time had taken their stand on the principle of world peace. Yet this is by no means equivalent to asserting that they provoked, or wished, the war; only that they, in spite of their love of peace, did not make their stand emphatic enough to prevent the outbreak of the war. But this was mainly due to the fact that they had had no time to free themselves from the limitations and weakness involved in the necessity of maintaining the equilibrium between different states, which so far had been unable to align themselves in the interest of one common desire. In other words, it was because the world-community was not yet politically organized. There was still lacking unity of purpose between the great mercantile states of the world-market. They did not see the problems in their magnitudes. They had not become clearly conscious of the fact that the world-state was so imminent.

But with the war it has become manifest how ripe was the time for taking the last step towards the consolidation of all the different states of the world into one political whole in which all the parts should obey the same law, serve the same principles and strive for the attainment of the same end—the establishment of law and order in the world. And when the war broke out the Prime Minister of England, Mr. Asquith, presented this goal and stated, as the representative spokesman of the federalistic world policy, what it involved.

It involves that, instead of wars for pre-eminence, which had been a result of the so far ruling principle of alliances, groupings, and a precarious equilibrium, there was to be created, so far as Europe was concerned, a unity based upon the acknowledgment of the principle of equality between the different states and built and held together by the common will of all the states to conserve the world's peace.

And so the federalistic conception concerning the manner of establishing the world-state was set forth, and world-peace propounded as its fundamental principle. This meant, that the absolutistic and nationalistic principle proclaimed by Germany must be superseded by the world-social and collective principle as being the only practical solution of the difficult problem.

The question therefore is, which one of these two conceptions is to gain the victory? From what we know of human progress up to our own day, and from the fact that the majority of civilized nations have rallied round the principle of federalism, as well as from what has occurred during the war, it appears that the federalistic conception of the world's future is bound to be victorious, and that with the social labor principle it will defeat the obsolete nationalism and erect the world-state in accordance with its own ideals.

It is clear from the developments of centuries and the very trend of modern thought that the warlike Germany is doomed to vanish and a new Germany to appear and become a part of that new humanity, the final victory of which cannot be doubted by those who believe that Christ is the Redeemer of the World.

Religion and the Church After the War

BY THE REV. HAMILTON SCHUYLER.

THAT the world today is upon the verge of radical changes, political, economic, social and religious is the general conviction of thoughtful minds everywhere. It is evident that such a tremendous event as the great world war must be fraught with equally tremendous consequences to the fabric of civilization. Experience warns us that subsequent to the war and as the result of its influence upon the lives of millions things can never return to their former state and hence a readjustment will be necessary all along the line. There will be another world, whether better or worse than the present cannot yet be determined, but in any event different. The hope is that the universal suffering through which the nations are now passing will find its outcome in a happier state for the future, but of this there is no certitude. Doubtless in the long run the great war will result in bringing immense benefits to humanity. It could hardly be otherwise, but as far as the immediate future is concerned, for ourselves and our own generation, we cannot be sure. Certainly the period of adjustment which will follow the war is likely to be one to try the souls of men.

The ferment which the war is causing everywhere, and which at present is finding its vent in actual fighting and in the feverish preparations which the military situation imposes, is certain, when that crisis passes, to find its outlet if not in actual violence and disorder yet in other disturbances no less critical. It is widely felt that we have yet to undergo the most trying times of all. When the millions in all lands now under arms shall return to their homes at the declaration of peace and strive to readjust themselves to the altered conditions of life many unexpected things are likely to happen. Those who have passed through the fiery crucible of war will never be as they were before. They will never be content to go back to the old ways or to submit to the old limitations. They will have imbibed new ideas, new aspirations will have seized them. They will demand new privileges and be impatient of the old conservatism and the old traditions. Possibly the changes which the war will bring to our own country will be less radical than in other lands, for we are living under a more elastic régime. Conditions are freer, opportunities are greater for the individual and class distinctions are not so marked. Yet it seems certain that in many ways life will be transformed even here. Democratic as our institutions may be deemed there is bound to be a further impetus given in this direction.

Those of the present generation are certain to find the adjustment to new conditions a difficult task, for they have been brought up and trained in other ways. The rearrangement of their lives in many instances is bound to produce hardship and perhaps in some cases even sharp suffering. The succeeding generation having known nothing else will not be thus affected. It will seem to them the natural order and they will look back upon the conditions as they prevailed before the great war with wondering eyes that we were willing to tolerate such a system. This has always been the case. The survivors of a revolutionary epoch have invariably bemoaned the break with the past and the hard necessity of fitting themselves into the new régime. They have felt that they were living in a bad and unfamiliar world. Much that they have been accustomed to

and cherished has passed away forever and left them resentful and unreconciled. It is the part of true wisdom to discount the changes which are sure to come and prepare to accept them in a cheerful spirit. The old world has gone or is going and with it has departed the scheme of life all of us have hitherto known. A new world is now in the making and we shall have to live in it whether we approve of it or not.

And what as to the prospects for religion and the Church? In view of the ferment of new ideas which may be expected to find its issue after the great war is it possible to believe that religion and the Church will experience no changes or modifications? In a period when all other institutions and customs will be subjected to an acid test to determine their fitness to survive can we hope that these, however venerable and precious, will prove exceptions to the rule? On the contrary it would seem likely that such will be among the first to pass under a searching scrutiny, to be called upon to justify their existence and to prove their worth.

For religion in the broad sense of the term there need be no fear that it will disappear. Man is a religious animal and he cannot permanently banish its ideals, promises, and restraints from his life. Though for a time he may abandon its practice and deny its necessity, yet, under the stress of his spiritual needs and the mystery of existence, he ever returns to it under some of its many forms. In its essential spirit religion is sure to remain, but not necessarily under the familiar phases. Much that was merely conventional and formal in religion will be certainly discarded though the essential ideas will be preserved.

The war with the terrible suffering which it has brought to countless innocent persons has caused, unto those exercised thereby, profound heart-searchings as to the meaning of religion and more particularly as to the accepted ideas of the divine nature and attributes. All facile explanations, all ready-made theories have had to go under the fierce reality of an unparalleled catastrophe. God no longer can be thought of as an easy-going deity, a doting celestial parent, whose chief func-

tion it is to protect his children from suffering and to minister to their earthly happiness. His love is revealed, not so much as expressing a benevolent sentiment, as being an inspiring ideal and a purifying flame. If "His mercy is over all His works," that mercy is plainly exhibited in no indulgent shielding from the effects of human tyranny and suffering, but rather, in the impartation of the strength to endure and the bestowal of the spirit of heroism, discipline and self-sacrifice. What some one has called "the grandmotherly notion of God" has gone forever and we have in its place the ideal of One who is able to console because He Himself has willed to enter personally into the sphere of human experience and share to the fullest degree the lot of mankind on this material earth. In other words the only God in whom henceforth it would seem possible for reflecting persons to believe is the God and Father of the Incarnate Son, even Jesus Christ, the suffering and crucified man of Galilee. No other God will be adequate to human requirements or deemed worthy to receive the love and reverence of a grief-stricken world. The alternative to the Christian God is not some remote and absolute deity of the philosophers, or the finite god of human invention, but blank atheism with its despairing watchword, "Let us eat and drink for tomorrow we die." Those who shall have passed through the fiery furnace of the war will know the naked realities of life and will be stripped of all their pleasing illusions. They will either emerge with an unwavering faith in God and in true religion, or they will have become fatalists and infidels. To which of the alternatives the majority will incline it is impossible to say.

We who cherish the Christian belief are hoping and praying that a new and stronger faith may animate the world after the war. We are looking to the younger men when they shall return to their homes to give the impulse to higher and nobler ideals of life and to take the lead in a fresh movement which shall put a new spirit into religion and lift this generation out of the rut of convention and indifference in which it has so long been sunk. The revival cannot come from us for we are the creatures of an old order and lack the initiative to strike out

into new and untried paths. Even the pressure of the war has not so far served to arouse the present generation out of its religious apathy and indifference. One would have supposed that the catastrophe the world is now facing would have forced even those who are only nominally Christian to seek for consolation and succor in the great Source whence these things proceed; but judging from superficial evidence, such as attendance at the Church services, there is no slightest movement in this direction. Perhaps the small minority of sincerely devoted Christians may have undergone a chastening of the spirit, but as far as the vast majority is concerned there is no sign as yet of an awakened interest in fundamental religion. "Business and pleasure as usual" seems to be the prevailing sentiment. In the presence of the most tremendous crisis in the world's history one looks in vain for any evidence of a genuine spiritual awakening or for the consciousness of a desperate need of divine succor. As it was in the days of Lot when they did eat and drink, bought and sold, planted and builded, until the day came when Sodom was destroyed with the rain of fire and brimstone, even so it would seem to be with this generation. But perhaps before the crisis passes, when the days of lamentation and mourning shall arrive for the multitudes who shall never return, the reaction we are looking for may come.

As with religion, so with its outward embodiment in the Church. We cannot doubt that there will be great changes in the ecclesiastical structure following the war. While the Church in its essential features will remain, great and needed reforms will surely take place. For one thing, like all other institutions, it will have to become more democratic if it is to grow and prosper under the new order. The ancient foundations will remain, but the accretions and accidents will have to go. The new age will demand unity and simplicity. There will be no room for unessentials or merely decorative doctrines and practices. The demand will be for reality unencumbered with mere traditional glosses. The Church must furnish a true religious home for the plain people, a body of doctrine which will satisfy the spiritual needs of the way-faring man.

Its pulpit must instruct rather than merely exhort and please. Its altar must attract rather than repel. There will have to be a stronger consciousness of brotherhood among its members, a real discipline for the indifferent and careless, and greater freedom and elasticity in worship. So much would seem imperative.

Undoubtedly in the near future American Churchmen will have to struggle hard to preserve and maintain unimpaired their full Catholic heritage. In the face of a great popular movement for the merging of all the discordant religious forces represented in this country in one main organization and under one polity, the numerically small body to which as Anglican Catholics we owe allegiance will have to fight for its very existence. The pressure which will be exerted both from within and without to force us to abandon, or, at least, to compromise some of the most precious and vital elements of faith and order will be enormous. The temptation to surrender essential points, or those which have always heretofore been regarded as such, will be presented under the most specious and insidious forms. We shall be entreated in behalf of the great cause of "Christian unity," or comity, not to stand aloof from the supreme popular movement of the day, but to readjust our doctrines and our practices in the interest of a common end. The charge will be made, and honestly credited in many quarters, that we care more for the preservation of sectarian identity than for the upbuilding and prosperity of what is euphemistically termed "American Christianity"; that we place narrow ecclesiastical advantages above broad religious interests. Indeed, that charge is being insistently made today and will be certain to gather additional force and plausibility when the war is over, and the most cherished institutions and practices are called in question and challenged to prove their utility and even their right to survive under the new order by a generation detached from the traditions of the past.

What view of the matter the young Churchmen now serving in the ranks may be presumed to take none can say. It is possible that they may tend to regard our continued ecclesiasti-

cal aloofness from the main current of sectarian religious life and activity as wholly unjustifiable in view of the supposed advantages which the merging of the various religious forces in this country may be thought to offer. Conscious of the benefits of co-ordination and co-operation in military and civic affairs, and having observed the more or less successful efforts of the various religious agencies in uniting to minister to the spiritual interests of the soldiers, it may be that they will favor an undogmatic form of Christianity, with a Church which has jettisoned her cargo of sacraments and apostolic order, and merged her identity in a heterogeneous society, wherein all its constituent parts have scaled down their doctrines to a bare minimum and pooled their differences in the interest of a colorless religiosity and a vague humanitarianism. On the other hand it may well be that these young Churchmen shall have learned through personal experience to prize even more deeply the ministerial priesthood and the sacramental system which the Church stands for and thus bring to us who shall have remained at home invaluable testimony to the intrinsic importance of the very things, which, in the interest of a delusive compromise, we are now asked to abandon, or, at least, to stress as minor considerations.

The solution of these and similar problems lies hidden in the womb of the future and only time can demonstrate what the ultimate issue will be. In the meanwhile, those of us who are concerned for the extension and prosperity of the Catholic Church and the integrity of its organic life and apostolic heritage can only look forward with hope, mingled with some measure of anxiety, to the new era. The impulse which shall give character and direction to religion and the Church in the succeeding age cannot, as I have said, come from the present generation, but must, under God, find its source and spirit in the next. For us of the present generation it is a counsel of high wisdom to recognize the catastrophic nature of the times in which we are living and to brace ourselves to meet with faith and courage whatever changes may be impending under the new order.

The Religious Use of the Imagination

BY THE RT. REV. CHARLES FISKE, D.D., LL.D.

THIS hardly seems a time in which to write on topics purely devotional. Here we are, living

in a grand and awful time,
In an age on ages telling
To be living is sublime.

Surely, then, one can hardly think of religion save as we bring it into touch with the Great War and its spiritual lessons for the Nation and the Church.

Yet, what does this mean but that men are hungering, as never before, for the old truths—translated, as they must be, of course, into terms of modern thought, to meet modern needs; but old, nevertheless, though ever new in their application.

Both clergy and laity seem to forget this, sometimes. The pulpit becomes too often a mere recruiting platform or a sales dépôt for Liberty Loan bonds. We want the Church to inspire to service and sacrifice, but we want it to do more than this—and when laymen get down to hard thought about it, they discover that they also want it to do more and to be more. A clever English Churchman, who must be something of a thorn in the flesh for his brethren, wrote some years ago on “One of the Chief Causes of the Decay of Religion: *viz.*, the Activity of the Clergy in Every Good Work.” How true it is! Were we to preach on all the subjects enthusiastic advocates of various measures ask us to preach on, and pursue with diligence all the matters about which we are told the Church should concern itself, there would be little room for instruction on ordinary matters of faith and morals.

It does seem that the real call now is for a spiritual message—clean, clear, straight—sounding again the old Christian truths without which men would go mad in a world like ours, with Europe soaked in blood and faith trembling in dismay: a message, of course, from men who have faced the difficulties of the-

ology and of life, but, above all else, a message that has in it the ringing note of a certain faith and the transparent sincerity of a life lived close to God. Are the clergy preaching such sermons—sermons that have in them what we may call the “lifting” quality? Do we speak as prophets and messengers of the Eternal? Do men, even rarely, hear us with the conviction that we are true seers? Have we, in any measure, the vision to discern, and the gift to translate what we see, so that we create, as it were, a spiritual environment and men are impressed with the reality of the divine?

In what Lyman Abbott calls one of the most pathetic passages in modern literature, Professor Clifford says: “We have seen the spring sun shine out of an empty heaven, to light up a soulless earth; we have felt with utter loneliness that the Great Companion is dead.” The Great Companion is dead! Theoretically and theologically, of course, that experience has not been ours. For us God is no blind, impersonal energy. He is God the Father, and He is revealed in the person of His Son Jesus Christ. And yet—and yet—practically how much do we really know about the companionship of God? The *personal* knowledge of God, the *personal* friendship of Jesus Christ,—how is it that just the moment we use the words we begin to qualify them and pare them down, as if they must be something less than they seem to be? To be in conscious, felt, sustained relationship with God, so that He lives in us, thinks in us, acts with us—why does it so often seem visionary and unreal, mystical and forced? Human friendship, of course, means something like this. Can friendship with God mean the same? To make God my constant companion—to feel as the two disciples on the road to Emmaus felt, when a third Person walked with them—to make God one who shares my life more really than does any one else, who enters more intimately into my thought than does any other person, whose friendship counts for more than other friendships—if that is what the personal knowledge of God means, how many of us must confess with a sigh that we too seldom dream of its

possibility? For many of us—is it not true?—the Great Companion is dead!

How are we going to bring Him to life again? I believe it is very largely a matter of imagination. Not that the companionship of God is a mere poetical fancy. I use the word imagination, not as the plastic or creative faculty of the mind, but as its image-producing power, the faculty by which we project images and make pictures. The poet is an imaginative writer, whether he deals with fact or fancy. He *sees* something, and then he “agonizes” until he finds language in which to reproduce what he has seen so that others may see also. In religion we must be fact-poets. We need to make mental images, not of imaginary things, but of things that really exist. We must picture them to ourselves and so make their reality forever clear. Unless we make ourselves see them, we soon lose the sense of their truth. Faith, as a spiritual act, cannot attach itself to abstractions. We must in some way give solidity and validity to the things invisible, towards which our faith is directed, and upon which it is riveted.

In some sense we need the poetical faculty for the conception of the divine. This is what Stedman means when he says that in the last analysis it will be found that imagination has impelled even the saints and martyrs of humanity. Modern scientific imagination, he says, goes in a second to the darkness beyond the utmost star, speculates whether the ether itself may not have a limiting surface, posits molecules and atomic rings, spends itself upon the ultimate secrets of existence. In something the same way, the religious imagination sweeps us up from man to God, from human thoughts to thoughts divine, from human beauty, marred by imperfections, to a heavenly beauty all perfect and unmarred; from human relationships and friendships to intercourse with the divine.

It is only in this way that we come to a vital appreciation of the companionship of God. I wonder, sometimes, whether the same gift of imagination does not have a very large influence upon any real belief in Him whatever. The very name of Father, by which I call God, is in that use of it a figurative

word, and like all figures of speech involves an exercise of the imagination. We call God Father, not simply because our life springs from Him as its fountain and source; but because in His relations with us we believe there is the divine counterpart of all that fatherhood is meant to be on earth.

Someone to whom I was speaking on such lines recently objected that this is to fall into anthropomorphism. But I conceive that there is a great truth in the anthropomorphic idea of God. It is true in so far as it teaches that God is in some respects like man; false only when it teaches, or is supposed to teach, that God is in all respects like man; true when it predicates similarity, false when it predicates identity between God and man. God is unique. The attributes common to Him and to us are true of Him in an infinitely higher sense than they are true of us. In God they are found without limit and in absolute independence. To conceive of God with vividness we must carry over to Him certain qualities of our own—only in carrying them over we give the imagination full reign, that we may carry them over to infinite perfection.

To speak of God as our Father, then, is the language of imagination. It is one of the profound figures of speech through which the Hebrew expressed the idea of God as a moral God. It was only as he grew in appreciation of this idea of God that the Israelite came to see in his history the revelation of a gracious purpose. It was the same poetical genius, fired by inspiration, that gave him his vivid belief that the whole story of the human race is an organic unity, event growing out of event by a natural development, a process in which each step prophesies of the end—that “one far-off divine event toward which the whole creation moves.”

The more we study the Old Testament books the more we see that poetry is latent all through them. This is not to say that there is untruth in them. Imagination, poetry, is a necessary element of truth. As Matthew Arnold pointed out, it is more accurate to describe God as “the High and Holy One that inhabiteth eternity” than to say that He is “the moral and intelligent governor of the universe,” though the latter is

a scientific statement of fact, and the former is poetry. More than half the difficulties of the Old Testament arise from the lack of poetic instinct in scientist and theologian alike.

And when we come to the New Testament there is a like deplorable misunderstanding of the teaching of the Master. Much of it is in the rich, figurative speech of the Orient, and we need to study it in the spirit of the Orient. It may be that the contribution of the East to theology in our own day will so deepen our knowledge of Christian doctrine as to give us richer conceptions of the faith than our duller Western minds have yet attained. Despite the warning which the parabolic teaching of Christ sounds, when we come to His other teaching we rush into difficulties at once by insisting on the prosaic interpretation, forgetful that Jesus was a child of His time, and taught, first of all, for the people of His time; and forgetful, too, that the language of imagery which He used may convey truths and enforce realities, where the language of scientific prose would break down in the effort to express them.

To take an instance: It is commonly objected to the doctrine of the real presence in the Eucharist, that when our Lord said, "This is My Body, this is My Blood," He was speaking figuratively. Of course He was, in a sense. When He used the words, His Body stood before the disciples unimpaired, and He was surely not speaking in humdrum prose. The difficulty is that when men say that His language is figurative, they seem to think that to call it so is to empty it of all meaning. Whereas nearly all spiritual language is necessarily figurative. Its figurative character, however, warns us that the meaning to be conveyed is not less, but more; the very need of figure shows that the idea calls for a heavier burdening of the language; the soul of the words is charged with a greater mission. If the language is figurative, it is not on that account emptied of meaning; rather it is charged with a richer and deeper thought. The inner conception must be at least as great as the figure itself. All that the imagination can picture from the likeness—all, and much more—must inhere in the thing of which it is the likeness.

When I am talking with some one who dismisses the doctrine of the Real Presence with the objection, "Oh, but the words are figurative," I do not rely so much on an attempt to show him that he is altogether wrong in his objection. Rather, I say to him, Let us admit that we have here a figure of speech. Try to let your imagination take in all that such a figure must mean. Then try to conceive how great must be the reality which needs such a figure to express it. You have not made the Eucharist less mysterious, then—you have but deepened the mystery.

To turn from this digression to the main theme: It is largely by the religious use of the imagination that I grip not merely my faith in God, but my belief in the Incarnation. What we need, in seeking to apprehend Christ, the Son of God and Son of Man, is not less theology, or a new theology, but greater spiritual discernment, a more devout pondering of these things in the heart. Give the imagination play. Let it paint the picture. Let it re-create the life. Dr. Sanday does something like this, when in his chapter on "The Tentative Modern Christology," he suggests that the subconscious is the proper seat or locus of the deity in Christ. When I let my imagination play about that thought I begin to get a clear illustration that helps me to see how the divine in Christ is kept under, as it were, how it flashes up only as occasion requires; but it is there, underneath, all the while; so restrained that its exercise is at every moment perfectly adapted to the measure of the capacity of the developing manhood. My psychology may be all wrong, as I try to realize all this, and another generation may cast it away; but in the meanwhile I have formed an image that helps me to understand the greatest fact of revelation. Perhaps my imagination may prove to be at fault; but it has helped me to see things clearer for the moment, and it has made the truth of the Oneness of Christ so obviously a possibility in thought, that though my psychology change, my faith cannot.

I do not think it is too daring an assertion to say that the

Incarnation of Christ makes God real to us largely because it aids the imagination to picture God. If God is to be a reality to us, we must know Him as an ever present person. Consider how the apostles came to a knowledge of Christ's godhead. They did not reason it out from the godhead downward; they reached it by a natural ascent from the manhood upward. At first they thought of Christ as a good man, and God seemed very close to them, as God always seems near when we are in the presence of goodness. Then they knew Him as the Messiah; then in some special sense as the Son of God. Then at last they began to see His glory. It was a most wonderful thing. Within His flesh, deep down in the heart of His being, there was a secret that lay hidden and yet could be seen by those who had the eyes of habitual and patient faith. That secret was nothing short of the vision of all visions. It was the disclosure, the unveiling of God.

So Jesus Christ makes God the great reality—a Personal Being, who is an ever present Friend and Guide. But we must see Christ to know that. And we can see Christ only in spirit. We must be men of imagination, who can picture Christ as He was, and hear Christ again as men used to hear Him. We must turn our eyes back over the centuries that have intervened since He walked among men. Like St. John, we must ponder and weigh and wonder and brood till we, too, behold His glory—and lo! it is the glory of the only Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.

The highest truths, it has been well said, are not reached by analysis. The deepest appeal is not made to logic, but to imagination; not to the intellect, but to the heart. This is true, not only in religion, but in everything. To know and love nature is a simple thing, but it is also a higher thing than to know the geology of the rocks and the chemistry of the trees. To know and love flowers is a simpler, but a higher thing than to understand the botany of flowers. When science has done its best, or its worst, we need the poet, the prophet, the seer, to interpret nature to us, not by analysis but by constructive imagination. And when scientific theology has done all it can, we need the poet and the seer to interpret Christ for us.

Not only must I exercise my imagination to try to understand Christ's life—I am dependent upon the imagination if I am to preach it. For, after all, the sermon that reaches the heart is the sermon that makes men see the Master. It is He Himself, in the beauty of His life, in the wonder of His teaching, in the unveiling of His glory, it is He who wins men—not my words about Him. And if I am to help men to believe in Him, it is necessary, first of all, that I shall make them see Him. I fancy that one look into the face of Christ would melt many a careless heart. Every one of us clergymen will remember sermons we have preached which owed all their success to the fact that we simply pictured some scene in Christ's life so truly that men did indeed look into His face. Our best sermons are not those which have the greatest depth of thought, but those which have the most vivid imaginative force and passion. There must be in our preaching that which is akin to the poetic fire. Hugh Black reminds us of how a great preacher used to say that in preaching, the thing of least importance is the sermon. What he meant was, that with the preacher it is not what he says but *himself* that counts most. The spiritual atmosphere he creates, the indefinable impression of earnestness and seriousness and conviction—this is the great instrument of persuasion. You have been awed and influenced by speech not one word of which you can remember. It is not important that you should remember anything; but it is of infinite importance that your imagination should be fired and your heart moved, that you should be impressed by the realization of some particular truth, and most of all assured of the reality of the spiritual world. In preaching, what counts is not a man's words, but all that lies back of his words.

After all, this is only to say that the measure of a man's power is always his depth. And the quality of depth can come only by going apart, so that truth can be taken into the soul, and wrestled with, and pondered on, and assimilated, until we are possessed with it and feel our souls swept by its force.

It is for this reason that meditation lies at the root of the spiritual life. Meditation means the cultivation of the image-

making faculty. It means quiet and intense thought—a mind so concentrated that it finally seizes upon the very core of the subject and looks round it and through it, and sets it by itself, and images it forth. “It was in this way,” says Robertson, “that one of the greatest of English engineers is said to have accomplished his most remarkable triumphs. Sometimes a difficulty brought all his work to a pause. Then he would shut himself up in his room, abandon himself intensely to the contemplation of that on which his heart was set; and at the end of two or three days would come forth serene and calm and walk to the spot and quietly give orders which seemed the result of superhuman intuition.” His meditation had fixed upon his mind a picture of what he was to accomplish and he had only to reproduce the lines his imagination had drawn in thought.

The illustration will make it plain that the meditative imagination is not simply to carry us into realms of mysticism. Not at all. The man who learns to see visions and dream dreams is the one who accomplishes practical results and lives a life of practical religion. That is what the late Dr. Huntington pointed out in his lecture on the Trinity: “Practical religion,” he cries; “ah, how we cheat ourselves with phrases. Show me the man whose mind is full of heavenly imaginings, who dwells largely among things not seen, whose thoughts often take flight from the edges of this buying and selling world, that they may strike out into the pure air and find rest upon the wing as the sea-birds do, and I will show you one who will make the best of neighbors, the most public-spirited of citizens, the gentlest, kindest, truest, least arrogant of men.”

The man of imagination is the man of action. What an example we have of that in the cathedral now partially built in New York, the splendid dream of the great Bishop who laid its foundations. Some may remember an article he wrote when the cathedral project was in its inception. One might read it again today, and find it an almost perfect description of what has come to pass. Those who knew Bishop Potter

knew, too, that back of the cultured man of society, the polished citizen of the world, was the man of meditative prayer. In a short address he gave years ago he showed the plan of his day's work, with its patient saving of odd moments, its jealous guarding of occasions for devotion. It was this that gave depth to his life—and it was this that made him the man of power and influence we knew him to be—because the power of a man is always in proportion to the depth of his life.

The man of imagination is the man of action. The man of imagination is also the man of devotion. Because if we are to make our worship deep and real, we must make it concrete. Worship cannot attach itself to abstractions any more than faith can. We must have something concrete toward which to direct our faith. That is one reason why our Lord gives us grace through sacramental signs. He knows that we are not disembodied spirits, we are here in material bodies, with all the drawbacks of the material. Glimpses of heaven appear to us, and then we fall back to earth, the soaring spirit held down by the flesh. So faith is stimulated by sense, grace is brought through sensible channels; there is always something to see, taste, touch, handle.

One thinks, too, of material as well as sacramental helps. There lies the devotional value of sacred art. Lyman Abbott, in one of his addresses, tells of a visit his grandchild was making him. Every morning they took him to the photograph of his mother, and every morning he stood there quietly, and said to the photograph, "Mother." It moved Dr. Abbott to a confession hardly to be expected of him. "Doubtless," he says, "there is danger lest the soul shall substitute the image for the reality, the crucifix for the Christ. I do not discuss that; but I do remind my Protestant hearers that it may be less acceptable to Christ to forget Him altogether than to recall Him to our thoughts by means of a statuette or a picture."

What a realm is opened here for the cultivation of the imaginative faculty through some of the neglected accessories of public worship. And yet how much we can do for ourselves, even though the sanctuary be little adorned. For, when all

is said, in worship we must ourselves give validity and concreteness to things that are spiritual, and there is no better way of doing this than through the devotional use of our imaginative faculty. We can paint the pictures that are not there on the walls or in glass, and paint new ones, with a new appeal, at every new service.

For example, at the Holy Communion we shall find it most helpful to make such mental pictures as the celebration proceeds. Thus, while the decalogue is read, we may let the imagination play about the circumstances of the original promulgation of the Ten Commandments on Mt. Sinai, or we may think of Christ's application and spiritualization of them in the Sermon on the Mount. At the Creed we may be a witness of St. Peter's splendid bearing and a hearer of his ringing tones as he says, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." At the offertory, we may see the poor widow casting her two mites into the treasury; at the confession, the publican smiting on his breast and saying, "God be merciful to me, a sinner"; at the absolution, Christ Himself bending over the man with the palsy and saying, "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee"; at the prayer of humble access, the woman that had been a sinner, prostrate at Christ's feet, washing them with her tears, wiping them with her hair, and anointing Him with costly ointment.

In Seminary days the students used to wax eloquent against the then frequent celebrations of the Eucharist on Maundy Thursday evening. Our disputings were silenced one year, when some of the students returned from the night service, the tears still in their eyes, the hush still in their hearts. That communion had meant much to them, because they could not take part in it without going back in imagination to the upper chamber and hearing, with singular directness, the words that fell from the Master's faltering lips. But why should we reserve for one day the spiritual vision that may be ours at every celebration, when Jesus comes and stands in the midst? Only a little quiet thought, only the cultivation of an easily

cultivated faculty, and each communion would be all that this one had been for the men whose reality of devotion had made us unwilling to press our arguments too far.

Most of all, the imagination must come into play if we are to practice the presence of God. To be with God it is not enough that we should be alone; we must use the image-making faculty to see that when we are most alone we are really not alone. The child's imagination conjures up shapes and forms as he enters the dark room; why should not the adult deliberately use the same faculty, not to give life to the fanciful, the fantastic and the unreal, but to help us appreciate the actual? Whenever God becomes real to men He drives them into solitude. And conversely, if the sense of God's presence is to be gained, if His companionship is to be realized, we must clear the way for His approach; we must make our wilderness, where we can be alone with Him. Other thoughts must be banished, that this one great thought may possess us, and fill us, and charge us with its power. If we are to be preachers with a message we must be like John the Baptist, who realized that it was of far more importance that one soul should be all on fire with the sense of the Lord's coming than that a whole city should be aroused and curious. If we are to serve God among men, it will only be when our souls have been lighted up by the presence of the Divine, it will only be when we have seen a vision of heavenly things, it will only be when we feel ourselves living with the Great Companion. We cannot do things unless the power to do them comes from God.

It helps, to know that there have always been men to whom this experience has been an actuality beyond question. Every age has had its great Friends of God—men and women who have been sure of Him, who knew how to speak to Him and were certain that He answered, who had no more doubt of Him than had the beloved disciple who was our Lord's "bosom friend," or Moses, who saw God "face to face."

This, then, is what I mean by the religious use of the imagination. It is to do our part in making God the great

reality; it is to practice the presence of God; not to create the presence, which of course we cannot do, but to re-create it for ourselves. It is to cultivate the imaginative faculty, not that we may be carried away on wings of fancy, but that we may gain the power to realize facts. It is to see visions and dream dreams—to picture spiritual facts and in the power of the vision to give embodiment to spiritual ideals. It is to cultivate the “hearing ear” and the “seeing eye.” It is to incline one’s ear to the parable. It is to listen to God. He is a living God indeed, who speaks to living souls.

“Let us not kill the poet in us,” says Dr. Black; “let us not kill the poet in us, for lack of listening and looking, the poet that dies so young in most of us. Let us cherish the passive, receptive mood with its simple intuitions and its high aspirations. We do not find the deep truths of life; they find us. Our part is only to incline the ear and open the heart. As rain and sunshine and balmy air fertilize the waiting earth, so gracious influences fertilize our souls, if we are responsive.” This is how the contemplative life—the life of imaginative meditation—breeds in men a rich wisdom, mellow, sweeter than all earthly activities, however varied, can achieve. If we live through this mysterious life on this mysterious earth, with no outlook on the unseen and the eternal, God must withhold from us His secrets. Seeing we shall see and not perceive and hearing we shall hear and not understand. The Great Companion is not dead. He is not talking, nor pursuing, nor on a journey, nor sleeping and must be awakened. It is we who are talking and pursuing and on a journey and asleep. We have only to listen, and we may hear Him speak; to stop running after we know not what, and we shall find Him at our side; to arouse ourselves from sluggish spiritual slumber, and we shall find ourselves in His presence.

Speak to Him, thou, for He hears
And spirit with spirit can meet.
Closer is He than breathing
And nearer than hands and feet.

Restoring the Balance

BY THE VERY REV. FRANK L. VERNON, DD.

THERE was a time when English Christians felt the necessity of restoring emphasis upon the Holy Communion. They felt that the Holy Communion had been perilously neglected. In the effort to restore emphasis upon one truth, which had been neglected, truths which had not been neglected were lost sight of. It is likely to be the mistake in every reforming movement at the beginning. The sense of proportion is apt to be lost. The balance of emphasis is apt to be disturbed. Time and experience and reflection may restore the sense of proportion. When this happens, a movement to regain the balance of emphasis is due.

For a long, long time, men of good faith and loyal will, within the Anglican Communion, have recognized that a redistribution of emphases upon essential truths contained in the doctrine of the Eucharist is necessary for the preservation of the Christian faith. As the sense of proportion has been regained, the significance of Eucharistic Adoration and Sacrifice has been more keenly and insistently felt. Dismayed observation of a religion which leaves out adoration and sacrifice, and is compelled to find its sole justification in social service, has driven men to see that the real thing of its kind is the only kind of thing that is worth while. The time has come to restore the balance. Adoration and Sacrifice must have their place in practical piety.

By Adoration, we mean that whereas Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, His Flesh, Soul and Divinity, is objectively present under sacramental forms, upon the altar, both at the time of the celebration of the Divine Mysteries and afterward when the Blessed Sacrament is reserved in the Tabernacle, therefore Our Lord's sacramental Presence is to be recognized, and adored after the manner of worship, shown by Almighty God to His ancient people Israel and continued in the Christian Church, with vesture, posture, music, candles, lamps, incense and every good gift of art, which has come down from the

Father of Lights to His children, whom He has created, equipped, endowed and directed, in public ceremonies, and in individual devotion before the Tabernacle, expressed by prayer, meditation and contemplation.

By Sacrifice, we mean, that the full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction made by our most Holy Redeemer Jesus Christ upon the Cross, is, in the Eucharist Mysteries perpetuated and re-presented at the altars of the Church; which sacrifice avails for the living and the dead, since it is verily and indeed the unbloody Sacrifice of the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world.

The loss of these truths of the doctrine of the Eucharist has resulted in a pathetic deprivation of Christian consolation and a tragic falling away from the very fundamentals of the Christian faith, on the part of untold thousands of souls.

The one bright spot in the times in which we are living, is that such crises have always been followed by an arresting and reconstructing manifestation of the power of the Holy Ghost in the Catholic Church. As the times reveal our needs, so, we may believe, will the times hasten the coming of our relief. And the time has come,—the time for re-discovery, restoration and redistribution.

The unfinished Reformation must be made complete. The balance of emphasis must be restored. Eucharistic Sacrifice and Eucharistic Adoration must be taught and practised, for Our Lord's glory and the peoples' necessities. This twentieth century Reformation will not be without its difficulties and its perils. Two reminders will serve us. The truth must be spoken. It must be spoken in love. Unless our reformers speak with that charity which suffereth long, and is kind; which vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things, their prophecies will fail, their tongues will cease, their knowledge will vanish away, and they shall be as nothing.

We shall all do well to keep in mind the admonition of St. Aidan to the impatient missionary, who having failed in his mis-

sion, attributed his failure to the stubbornness of the Northumbrians. "Was it their stubbornness or your severity," cried St. Aidan, "did you forget the apostle's command to feed them first with milk and then with meat?" Let us, then consider the difficulties under which so many people labor. Let us try to place ourselves in their position, in order that we may understand their attitude of mind toward these truths which we would have them accept.

Why do they not understand, when we speak to them of Adoration? Is not this the reason? On the surface, they have been distracted by irrelevant ritual, ritual which has lacked the objective of the sacramental presence, and which consequently has never conveyed to their minds a vital relation with their Lord. Back of this and under this, they have never understood the sacramental Presence. They have never understood because they have never been taught. They have never been taught because many of their bishops and priests have never understood. Their clergy have never understood because their seminary professors did not understand. And back of it all is the Church which hath erred in that it has neglected the emphasis upon the truth concerning Eucharistic Adoration.

It is not the peoples' fault. They are not to be blamed. They are sinned against, not sinning. When they know the Presence, they will adore.

Why do they not understand when we speak to them of Eucharistic Sacrifice? The loss of the knowledge of the sacramental Presence explains this also, I think. When the Presence on the altar was taken away from the people, the preacher in the pulpit was given to them as the central figure in public worship. For his day the preacher reigned supreme. When many preachers began to fail, the popular preacher appeared for his day. When the popular preachers began to fail, the organizing minister appeared, engaging his people in neighborhood work, practically limiting his presentation of the Christian religion to its social aspect, and openly flouting its sacramental teaching and practice. Then came the day of the institutional church. It had its day and then became at first affiliated, then

merged, and finally lost in secularized social service. The institutional minister is today dwarfed by the trained social worker. It is the social worker who looms large. It is social service which appeals to the popular imagination, and sociology has no doctrine of redemption from sin, by the Sacrifice on the Cross. "The modern man is not worrying about his sins, he must be up and doing," explains Sir Oliver Lodge. The people do not understand the meaning of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, because they do not understand the meaning of the Sacrifice on the Cross, and they do not understand the sacrifice on the Cross, because they have lost the sense of sin. Will it not, some day, be evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors that from the apostles' time, the Christian religion has been enshrined, set forth, and preserved in the Christian Eucharist, in which is set forth Christ's death, till He come? Will not men learn that to neglect the emphasis on the sacrifice of the Eucharist will only and always result in the loss of the doctrine of the Atonement? If the Reformation is to be finished, and if we would lay the axe to the root, we must not blame the people, we must pray and work to convert the social workers, we must carry to them the Gospel of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, or we must save our people from the social workers.

But since the emphasis has been laid upon Communion, why is Communion so occasional an act, a detached thing, an appendage to what is only too well known as the "regular morning service?" Why does not Communion yield more abundant fruitage of the knowledge of love of God? For what cause are so many weak and sickly and so many asleep? For the old reason. The people are urged to the very highest spiritual act made possible for man, to draw nigh and take the Body of the Lord; to present themselves, their souls and bodies, to worthily receive the precious Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. They are warned against the dreadful penalty of receiving unworthily, and the one sacramental means whereby they may be enabled to receive worthily has been made practically prohibitive. Deprived of Penance, they are invited to Communion!

Whose fault is this? Surely not the people's. They have never understood the sacrament of Penance. Their clergy have never understood. The sacrament of Penance has been neglected. The result has been the failure to attain the very ideal desired.

All this has not been a failure due to the lack of implicit doctrine in the formularies. The mysteries have always been contained in the treasury. The fault has been the fault of the Stewards. The failure has been the lack of explicit teaching and the neglectful practice of too many of the pastors. If the Reformation is to be completed, there must be brought about a restored emphasis upon the sacrament of Penance, lacking which conscientious and penitent Christians will refrain from Communion, and uninstructed Christians will eat and drink not discerning the Lord's Body.

What can be done to bring the whole Eucharistic gospel to the people? Most of them are meeting the supreme test of their faith and fortitude today. They are, as we all know, too sad, too troubled, too wearied to comprehend controversy. This very fact should make the Christian teacher's work the easier. The people need joy, more than anything else. It is our joy that we have, for them, good tidings of great joy. We must show the joy which is only found in all its fulness in the Presence of God. The joy of the Presence is the need of the hour.

The Joy of the Tabernacle must be shown: the joy of flying to Our Lord, under the Red Lamp, before the Golden Door, when the heart is sad and lonely and puzzled and afraid; the joy of remembering that the absent boy knows where to find his Friend, in every city and village into which he shall enter; the joy that makes hearts brave again and arms strong; the joy of Him who speaks from the Tabernacle, that our joy may be full. Once that joy is known as a valid Christian experience, the people will for themselves understand the throne and the golden candle-sticks and the incense and the hymns and the exultation and the bell and the hush and the blessing.

The joy of the Sacrifice must be shown,—the joy which the eager heart knows well, in the knowledge of the Priest who is Himself the Victim. The joy of the Holy Sacrifice must be

made known for the hour of bereavement, and the years of strain which follow; when at the elevation of the Host, the Christian sees His Lord interceding for those, his dearest and his best, and he by his Lord's prevailing Presence appeals that God will fold them closer to His mercy's breast, and do His utmost for their soul's true weal. That is the joy that takes away the sting of death and banishes funeral torture. To show that joy to one person, would be sufficient service for a lifetime.

The joy of Communion must be shown: the joy of the absolved penitent, after the swift whisper of absolution, and the inrush of the conviction that in heaven and on earth, he is loosed and free forever; the joy of the trembling boldness of the entrance into the Holy of Holies, where are the faithful departed and the Saints, and the Angels, and the Mother of God, and as his gaze focuses upon the white Disc of Mystery, Jesus; the joy of bearing Him in the heart, who is to be in the Christian the hope and glory, to cleanse and heal and restore and renew, and sensitize and illumine and transfigure and transform and unite in a union which shall never be broken. The joy in the joy which is to be the restored heritage of all who worship Our Lord as God and Saviour, this joy is a sufficient incentive to bear any cross which may be set before. It is a joy worth, well worth, all effort in prayer and work and patience till the Reformation is perfected and the balance restored.

The Cheer Up Philosophy

BY THE REV. HENRY S. WHITEHEAD, M.A.

I AM not a socialist because I believe that Christianity,—which is quite another matter,—and not socialism is the panacea for the sufferings of the world. But if socialism had done nothing else it would still be worthy a certain respect because it has driven home the important truth that palliatives are useless because they do not go to the roots, but rather foster and abet the evils they are meant to alleviate. Most of us see to-day that the effect of a mere palliative is somewhat akin to the effect of Christian Science, which may be said to intensify the ravages of disease by lulling the sufferer into the dangerous belief that as there is no disease there can be no suffering, thereby affording the disease every chance to increase and consume the body.

It is an attitude like this uncompromising one of the socialists against all schemes which will not fit four-square with their own that I wish to express against a prevailing popular philosophy, a system which expresses itself in terms of the human disposition, a favorite substitute of the “Modernist” for orthodox Christianity which he dislikes,—the philosophy of “Cheer Up.”

This philosophy is unsound because it is entirely subjective, ignores causes, and seeks to inspire an unreasonable contentment. The utterances of its propagandists are like this: “Never mind old man, keep on smiling even though you are getting the worst of it. Don’t commit the unforgiveable sin of trying to change your luck, simply change yourself into a smiler. Concentrate on your frame of mind and make that cheerful. Grin and bear it. Never repine. Smile through your tears! Of course its true, as you say, that the girl who pretended she cared for you and played with your honest affection and allowed you to buy her a wrist watch, has dropped you like a hot cake and is going with George Brown now. But that’s all right. Never say die. Cheer up and forget it! Don’t get angry at her; don’t let yourself get ruffled, old fellow.

When you see her treat her as though nothing had happened, for if you act as though you cared you'll be a Grouch and the world hates a Grouch. That will make lines in your face. Learn to spread sunshine, dear boy. Look on the bright side, too. Just suppose you had married her. She might have slipped on the front steps on her way from her father's front hallway to the nuptial automobile and broken her neck, and then you *would* have had something to worry over. Don't let the little things worry you. Remember how Mrs. Wiggs found cause for comfort in not having a harelip. Remember Pollyanna and her "glad game." Remember—

"The year's at the spring
And day's at the morn;
Morning's at seven;
The hillside's dew-pearled
The lark's on the wing;
The snail's on the thorn;
God's in his heaven—
All's right with the world."

"What are you in comparison with the whole world! Think of that lark and that snail that meant so much to Robert Browning, and—why, why,—come, dear fellow, CHEER UP!!!"

"Never mind if your razor handle did snap and now you can't strop the miserable thing because it wobbles sideways! Shem didn't bother with razors in the ark. I'd never let a little thing like a razor bother me."

"What difference does it make if it did rain every day for thirty-eight days and now your old garden seeds have all rotted in the ground? Remember what Riley says:

'When God sorts out the weather and sends rain,
Why, rain's my choice.'

"*That's* the way to look at it, old man. CHEER UP!!!"

The main trouble with these and other similar characteristic provocations to manslaughter is that there is no sympathy in them. Instead the person who receives the "cheer up" advice

is, in effect, told that his grief or natural annoyance is unimportant; and, since it is to him immediately and touchingly important, the advice, if he be a simpleton, simply stuns him, which does no good; or, if he possess a mind, strikes him as irritating impertinence. In either case it fails. Or, it may be, that the professional optimist conveys the impression that the fault is with the sufferer, otherwise it couldn't have happened. This form of consolation probably antedates the author of the Book of Job by some eras. Job himself recalls to mind an excellent example of trouble. One suffering from a painful boil,—and none of us is immune,—is not helped either by being told that there are greater things than boils,—which only makes him think of carbuncles and writhe harder,—or that boils do not exist. He knows better. He needs either sympathy or relief, that is, either a kind hearted friend to say “m-m-m-M-M-urrrrph!” or a skilful surgeon with a sharp lancet.

Professional optimists, one suspects, are insincere. It is quite possible to admire Elizabeth Barrett Browning's quality when she assures us beautifully that she lost the little cares that fretted her “out in the fields with God.” But it is beyond a doubt that Mrs. Browning (a rather sensible woman), would have had thoughts and a facial expression like the rest of us if on the way back from the fields she had been obliged to drive a pair of heifers a mile along a road flanked with much brush and many gateways. Or one can quite safely predicate the same imagined warmth of James Whitecomb Riley or even of that incurable optimist Josh Billings if one imagine either of these worthies dropping the soap in mid wash and having to fish it out, with wet and grubby hands, dusty and nasty from under the bathtub.

There are worse things than “grouches,”—insincerity for instance, or an unsympathetic disposition. Even the man with a chronic grouch deserves sympathy. In all human probability he has got that way because someone has done something outrageous to him, or perhaps, he suffers from stomach trouble, or inherited it and doesn't know it himself. If the promoters of the Cheer Up Philosophy really desire to accomplish some-

thing constructive and useful,—they are the kindest hearted people imaginable,—they could take courses in Sympathetic Pedagogy and offer sympathy to the afflicted and wholesome chastisement to those addicted to wronging their friends and acquaintances,—an enormous field of effort much undermanned.

The object of these worthy people is to promote happiness. The large literature they have produced witnesses, if only by its commercial success, to the large room for the exercise of efforts in this direction. The need for something of the kind is apparent to anyone who possesses five or more acquaintances. The only question has to do with the means. Shall it be the long, hard process of the Christian Life or shall it be the pastoral theology of the “Modernists” which is identical with the “Cheer Up Philosophy”? Recourse must be had to something.

The kind of happiness which the “red-blooded,” hearty variety of practising “Modernists” attempt to produce within their victims is a negative thing, secured, if ever, by inducing a mental state which ignores actual troubles. Sin is not overcome by a fight, it is ignored, denied. Psychologically, of course, this type of happiness is only a mental attitude, a purely subjective condition. If its end could be universally attained uniformity of mental state would make it possible to ignore circumstance and people would be indifferent to hunger and cold, pain and grief, and all the other evils which harrow the souls of men, because their souls would be asleep. Such a state of spiritual coma would bear the same relation to normal human happiness that the religion of Mithra bears to that of Christ. The apparatus would be nearly the same, the results might appear almost identical, at least externally, but one would have something actual back of it, while the other rested on a product of human imagination. Christ is Real; Mithra is a myth.

Christianity teaches that true human happiness is to be found in union with God through Jesus Christ. This involves a lifelong struggle called the Christian Life, otherwise expressed as the soul’s warfare with sin. Sin, broadly consid-

ered, may be defined as the centralizing of the universe in self and thinking, talking, and acting accordingly. Such an attitude is humanly natural, hence the specific doctrine called Original Sin, a perfectly clear and sound doctrine which has become greatly obscured by the concentration of men's minds upon the Hebrew tale of its origin by the ancestors of the human race in Eden which has a religious rather than an historical significance.

The Christian Life possesses the tremendous merit of practicability to commend it to those whose dispositions trouble themselves and those about them. But the Christian Life is a difficult process (called theologically the salvation of the soul,) like everything else which leads to a great reward. The effort required to liberate a soul from its humanly inherited ("original"), selfishness, the turning of it Godward, and the keeping of it thus directed, naturally and inevitably involves the sweetening of the disposition. This is another truth which has been allowed to become obscure, and it is rarely thought of or is passed over by the many who prefer a short-cut to happiness. A person with a sour disposition,—the kind of person at whom the literature and exhortations of the "Cheer Ups" is launched,—is not living the Christian Life or is making a sorry failure of it. Sainthood is the quality of a Christian, not respectability, not fastidiousness, not merely such things as commercial honesty. And the known saints did not and do not have grouches. People commonly get this fact confused with another and we have the phenomenon of professional religionists, saturated with bad theology, telling us that Christianity needs well and happy people to live it and appreciate it, and the logically associated phenomenon of social service replacing the bread and meat of the gospel instead of occupying its true place as a product of the digestion of that bread and meat.

If one approach consideration of the "Cheer Up Philosophy" from the Christian point of view, it will be clear to him how far off the track are those who tell us to cheer up in order to be happy. They have the sequence wrong. The cart is set

to pull the horse and the horse sleeps standing. For one does not cheer up in order to be happy. One is cheerful because he is happy, and the kind of happiness derived from cheering up is abnormal and delusive because it is the result of habitual auto-hypnosis.

To people in normal health on a sea voyage a whiff of dinner cooking in the galley puts a finishing touch on an appetite derived from the tang of salty breeze stiffly blowing. Not so the sufferer from seasickness. No amount of Job's comfort avails to raise him up, it even makes him worse. His state is the opposite to cheerful.

In mental disease it is the same. Depression is the most typical form of mind sickness. The melancholic insane cannot cheer up because they are not happy, and they are not happy because their malady has destroyed or suspended their capacity for happiness by casting into their mental machinery a monkey wrench of obsession. Wise alienists charged with their cure do not merely attempt to cheer up their patients. Rather they seek to remove the wrench from the machinery and then to patch up the machinery. If this can be done the capacity for happiness resumes its function, and the patient, restored to happiness becomes cheerful.

The same principle applies to sickness of the soul. A person spiritually ill, that is, suffering from the disease of sinfulness, has no relish for the simple pleasures in which those enjoying spiritual health find delight. He loathes innocent enjoyment, which has the same effect on him that seeing others playing a game has on the depressive insane, or the sight of people eating heartily upon the seasick.

The sight of a cheerful sick man who is not a Christian is both remarkable and stimulating because it is both abnormal and attractive like a black eyed child with golden hair. Similar but more pathetic is the sight of a lunatic displaying a grin, which is ghastly. But the spectacle of one morally bad in the aspect of good cheer transcends the singularity of a pleased invalid and the horror of a maniac's laughter, for it forces upon the sight of the shuddering beholder an image of the Father of Lies.

The Heart of Our Religion

*An Address Delivered Before the Confraternity of the Blessed
Sacrament, May 30, 1918.*

BY CHAUNCEY BREWSTER TINKER.

THERE are certain positive spiritual advantages in living, as we do, in the midst of a crumbling world. For the Christian there should be nothing especially unusual in the realization that the world is falling in ruins about his feet. Our Lord, who Himself wept over a crumbling civilization, promised nothing whatever to the children of this world, but consistently taught that, renouncing this doomed and fleeting world, His disciples were to conceive of themselves as citizens of another and a spiritual Kingdom whose walls were serenely rising, far from the red ruin of earth, into the eternal beauty of the City of God. Our citizenship is in heaven. So long as the Church was true to the spirit of her founder, she deliberately inculcated a contempt of the world. *Hora novissima, tempora pessima sunt, vigilemus*. It is only in her Babylonian captivity to modern science and paganism that the Church has tried to effect a truce with the children of this world, and has permitted men to believe; and certain of her priests to teach, that her chief business is with humanitarianism, broadmindedness, and material progress—ideals which were tried and found wanting thousands of years ago.

And now, when the cup of trembling is pressed to the lips of the nations, the cry is raised that Christianity has failed. The charge has been heard from scientist and priest, agnostic and mystic. A whirlwind of answers and explanations has raged in fury. It has been asserted that it is not Christianity that has failed, but civilization, democracy, socialism, diplomacy, protestantism, "progress," science. It is clear, in the face of the present crisis, that just everything has failed. But in the persistent charge that it is Christianity that has failed, there is, I find, something peculiarly interesting and even inspiring. It is something to have been accused of failure. One was not expected, then, to fail? This is the surprising thing. For a century the world has heaped contempt upon the Church.

She has been accused of obscurantism, worldliness, and all manner of spiritual deadness. She might, one would think, have been expected to fail. But now, in the hour of need, the critics of Christianity have yielded the whole point at issue, and have revealed what they really expected. I am stunned, not by the magnitude of the charge which is made against the faith, but at the fact that the charge is made. The scoffing world had, then, expected to be saved by Christianity, after all?

I do not propose to waste time in discussing the fairness of the charge. God knows that the Church has failed to rise to, or even to realize, her opportunities. But the important question for us now is how to discover a remedy, how to minister to a world lost in spiritual despair. Where is the healing power to be found? I am not indulging in a mere trick of rhetoric when I say that I believe that the panacea is to be found here within these walls. If there should be anyone here who thinks this statement slightly tinged with the enthusiasm of madness, it is because he has never risen to a conception of the function of the Confraternity that meets here this evening or of that holy sacrament, to the honor and exaltation of which the Confraternity was founded. If the world feels today that at the heart of its tragedy is the failure of religion, then it is clear that in the heart of a true Christianity is the solution of the whole terrible problem. I take the heart of a true religion to be the proper conception, worship, and use of the Blessed Sacrament. Hence I am compelled to believe and to assert that a proper realization of the function of this Confraternity and a proper conception of sacramental religion is just the most important matter with which anyone can busy himself in this crazed and agonizing age. Sin, in all its manifold aspects of greed, hatred, and utter worldliness, has brought us to this pass, and the Blessed Sacrament is the cure for sin.

Now we Catholics have heard all this set forth in its fulness for generations. Precisely the most difficult thing is making an address such as this is that there is nothing new to say. There is no news but the old news, no Gospel but the old Gospel. We have heard it all so often that we have grown lethargic to its glory; our ears are stopped, not only by an

inborn, unregenerate nature, but by a sort of stupidity, or what athletes call "staleness." We are just apathetic. It is as though we had recited the multiplication-table so long as to paralyze our minds and to be incapable of its practical application. There is enough glory in one paragraph of the Mass to lift one out of the silly world altogether and plunge him face downward before the throne of God with angels and arch-angels, and the whole company of heaven, if only he could practically believe what he is talking about. But the fact is that we are completely surrounded by people who do not believe anything worth speaking of, and we are blighted and blasted by their indifference and unbelief, for the simple reason that we have not force enough to attack it, or clear-headedness enough to speak out and tell the deluded world that it is missing the most essential thing in life. The hour for telling it so has arrived, for the world appears to be in a mood to admit that it has been somehow or other deluded—a fact so obvious now that even the world cannot miss it. But we go on in our dear old stupid fashion, listening to the music of our incomparable liturgy, and failing to apply the soul of that liturgy so as to make music in our lives. I tell you, my friends, the whole problem before us is not to find some new thing, but simply to learn to use what we have. Let me illustrate. Some weeks ago we all listened to these words:

But chiefly are we bound to praise thee for the glorious resurrection of thy son Jesus Christ our Lord; for he is the very Paschal Lamb, which was offered for us, and hath taken away the sin of the world; who by his death hath destroyed death, and by his rising to life again hath restored to us everlasting life.

Suppose that those words entered fully into our lives, what would be the result? Suppose somewhat less than that, that they entered fully into the lives of the few of us here, what would be the result? I will tell you. On the principle of the leaven and the lump, a principle given to us by the highest authority we know, it would mean a revivifying influence in the Protestant Episcopal Church such as would solve ultimately all the com-

plex problems that confront her, and that influence, under God, might mean an ultimate renewal of the ancient and mediaeval ages of faith—those great ages that have blossomed into heroic lives and martyrdoms and ennobling arts, and all those lovely things that are added unto such as are truly in search of the Kingdom of God. The great Christians, I take it, began their spiritual growth at about the point where most of us leave off. S. Louis and S. Francis, I imagine, believed the faith of the Catholic Church rather literally, and the best thing for us and for our Communion, through us, would be to get back to the Catholic faith, literally accepted and faithfully lived by.

Or take another illustration, yet nearer, if possible, to our peculiar interests and endeavors. Suppose that we, as a Confraternity, were to enter fully into the meaning of the Mass, with all it implies of a loving God continually sacrificed for us, a God dwelling in our midst in the panoply of His eternal power, the living God, by whom all things were made, and to whom all things in heaven and earth do bow, the creating power which hurled the planets into space and which dwells humbly in the loving heart of a little child. Suppose that for the next decade we lived joyously and lovingly in our faith, making the worship of Him in His sacramental presence on our altars the chief fact and interest in our little lives, do you think that there would be any question of our becoming the greatest power in this land? If you do doubt it, then your faith is feeble, if not vain; and the power of the divine might is not promised to vain or feeble faith. However we may look at these matters, it is difficult to escape the personal responsibility that is imposed upon us unto whom have been revealed the innermost things of God. All our troubles come back to the distressing fact that we do not take seriously the indwelling of the Spirit of God. In all the controversies and quarrels and impoverished ambitions that so easily beset us, I cannot rid my mind of the suspicion that they are all to be disposed of by the simplest Christian means, means that a child may employ. Love of and prayer to the Blessed Sacrament will make an end of all of them. Consider some actual cases.

We of the Confraternity have been in the past, and we are

bound to be again, the source and center of certain controversies. We have contended earnestly, and we believe with justice, for certain things which have been denied us in the practice of the Catholic faith. We have won them now; we believe that we have won them back for ever, and we dedicate our effort to their wider recognition; our presence here today has been an act of gratitude for past blessings and a consecration to renewed effort. But let us not win these things at a cost which it is probably not necessary to pay. I speak this out of a full heart; for I am by nature an impatient person. I am, by instinct, all for plunging ahead, and for a policy of ramming and cramming. I fear I am a "spike," and I know I enjoy the baiting of Protestants. I rather enjoy seeing the fat in the fire. Yet I question whether we have not at times stirred up a quite unnecessary amount of prejudice and hard feeling. I have heard of parishes where the Catholic ceremonial has been introduced from quite other motives than the great and central one of devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. It may even be that there are those here this evening who have come to see what new audacities we shall dare to enunciate, who have come in idle (or interested) curiosity to see what we are up to now. If so, I hope that those who came in distrust of us may go away with a not unintelligent sympathy; that they may realize from our bearing, if not from our words, that all that we do or wish to do is to be inspired by a simple love of God, a God whom we believe to be, in a very precious and particular sense present among us. At least I wish that our critics—if critics there be—might go out from among us with a realization that our one great ambition is for a more vital kind of prayer, and should be willing to say, that even though they may not agree with us, our aims are primarily spiritual, not controversial nor partisan. That such a realization should be spread abroad among our people depends on the devotion that you and I show to the Blessed Sacrament, for if we do not show to the Church that we have been with God, we have, whatever practices we may regain or propagate, assuredly failed of our real duty.

Again, let us suppose that, in some particular case, it is the fervent wish of some member of this Confraternity that in his

own parish church the Mass should be the chief service on Sunday. Do you know any surer way of promoting that cause than by a devotion to the Blessed Sacrament? Do you think that any intelligent rector would hesitate to make that change if he were confronted at eight o'clock every Sunday morning by a huge congregation, and at eleven o'clock matins by a sparse one? And how is the devotion ever to spread if people do not come to realize that those of us who do believe in the Mass as the great heritage of the Church have a secret source of power which is denied to others. Will you permit me to cite my own experience? In the days, not so very long ago, when I was an agnostic, the thing I could never make out about certain friends whom I was pleased to call "high Church," was that, in spite of much that I did not understand, and many respects in which I thought them much worse than ordinary men, there was something which held them, as I knew nobody else to be held by his religion. They did not talk much about this matter, indeed, I do not recall they were ever engaged in propaganda. There was just a quiet conviction that they had got hold of the essential thing, and that there was no use in discussing doubts, and higher criticism of the Gospels, and the aesthetic charms of Buddhism, and the possible reconciliation of science and religion—all of which I was very eager to discuss, convinced that, if I could only get them to argue with me, I could soon make mince-meat of their religion. But these men were beyond the necessity of talking. And so they annoyed me. What is more to the point, they piqued my curiosity. There was, in particular, I recall, one fellow who was by no means what I should call a pious man—in fact, I do not think that, even today I should be justified in referring to him as a very religious man—and yet to him there had been revealed this one crowning fact of life, that, if there were any religion at all, it was centered in the Holy Communion, and every now and then I heard of him as assisting at its celebration. I do not think that he knows to this day that he had an influence upon me. I doubt whether he would be very much interested if he did know it. I can hear him saying, if told, "Oh, really!" But the fact remains. And so it is that since my own conversion,

I have become more and more skeptical of talk about these things, and more and more convinced that it is lives of quiet and continuous devotion to the Catholic faith that do the work of the Spirit. What we need is a general curiosity, among those who do not understand us, about what it is that holds us, a curiosity that may develop into a kind of envy, which, in turn, when it is fully developed may lead to inquiries—inquiries which may enable us to say, with S. Philip, “Come and see,” in the quiet confidence that, if there is anything more to be done, the Holy Ghost will do it through the Church.

One more illustration. It may be the case with you, as it is with me, that you long to see the day when the Blessed Sacrament may manifest itself in an increasing use in our communion of the service of Benediction, that beautiful devotion in which the exaltation of our Lord present in the blessed elements is so fittingly and clearly expressed that none can be longer in doubt with regard to the doctrine of the Real Presence, as the central fact in our worship and our belief. But it would not be a happy day for us if that service became common and it had no sure foundation in a love of the incarnate life which we may receive into our own famished spirits in the Holy Communion. I can think of nothing more distressing than to have the blessed privilege of Benediction and of exposition and processions of the Blessed Sacrament in churches where there are but a handful present at the early Mass, and no life of penitence and abstinence. That it will come naturally in parishes fitted to receive it is my most earnest conviction. I do not believe that there will be restrictive legislation or episcopal condemnation of that devotion if we are first careful to let a love of God be the reigning motive in our religious lives. I will not believe that even our bishops will discourage prayer, if only they can be made to realize that it is a more fervent and effectual prayer, towards which we are striving. If you would like to see that day, then pray for a larger faith in the sacramental presence of God.

My friends, there is no other way. If there is anything in the Christian faith, it follows that all these little matters are to be solved by the great principle of the life of Christ, and

that principle is love. I have said before, and I will say again that if the people of God would for one year devote themselves to manifesting forth the virtue of joy alone, the whole world would feel the impact of our faith. What we all want is joyous lives, and joy in the Lord dwelling with us would win the whole of our communion to the Catholic faith. But joy is a secondary or derivative thing. True joy is found only in those who are in continuous communion with eternal forces; and the eternal force with which you and I stand in sure and permanent relation is the sacramental presence of Christ in bread and wine, in the approach to which we are close to that sacred and beating heart which is the true center of this mysterious universe, and which, we stand assured, will draw all men unto it.

The Indispensableness of Bible Study

BY THE REV. FLEMING JAMES, PH.D.

IN his novel, *John Inglesant*, Shorthouse says somewhere that there is a type of Christianity wholly divorced from Bible-reading; and I think we must admit the truth of his assertion. Sad would it be for the Kingdom of God if His children could not enter into it, and do much excellent work for it, without the study of Scripture. For very few can qualify as such students, or even as readers of the Word. It may be different in England. Father Tyrrell, in that scathing denunciation of mediaevalism hurled back at the now famous Cardinal Mercier, declared that bishops in the English Church had no need to urge their people to own a copy of the New Testament, and to keep it on their shelves. We in America find ourselves unhappily in the same necessity as the Belgian prelate, of remedying a condition of gross neglect. Most of our congregation do not read God's Word, yet they in many instances are earnest followers of Christ. Candidates for the ministry exhibit generally a profound ignorance of the English Bible, but few among them are unworthy of the high calling they seek. The shepherds and pastors of the flock often let their New Testaments lie idle for a season, yet in just these

seasons do they prove by efforts in behalf of parish and community their share in the spirit of Jesus. And so let me begin my paper on the indispensableness of Bible study by a frank recognition that Bible study is not indispensable.

And yet, it is. If our concern in the Christian life is not to find how much we can do without, but how much we can gain; if we are not content to be useful merely, but would become as useful as possible; if we cherish the apostle's ambition for the man of God to be "complete, furnished completely unto every good work"—then there is no escape: we must study and know our Bibles. What I would maintain is only this, but nothing less than this: that such study gives something not to be got elsewhere.

Let us be clear on one point at the outset. By study of the Bible I do not mean study about it. That is only the vestibule, well named the Introduction. We should hold on to that now classic term with its plain implication. Many of the excellent books we are reading today by Harnack and Loisy and Ramsay and Deissman are nothing more than just so much introduction; they bring us to the door of the temple and open it. The real study of the Bible is something else: it is the searching with all the powers of mind and heart the Scripture itself. It is the reading and rereading, the pondering over, the inward digesting of Gospel and Epistle, of Prophecy, Psalm, and History. Everywhere we hear the complaint of genuine Bible scholars that this one essential thing is neglected.

To dig persistently, then, into the Bible as into a mine from which alone can be extracted the metal that must form a necessary part of the structure of character and power—that is what I have in mind when I contend that to study the Bible is indispensable.

At once, in advancing such a contention, we are met by a contrary theory or theories. For the better sort of those who leave the Scripture to one side are proceeding upon some principle. They feel they cannot be charged with simple neglect, they demand that we prove to them first of all that they are losing something vital by omitting Bible study. They deny any

such loss. "Show me," they say, "why I should take my time and thought to become familiar with this ancient Book?"

Suppose that we counter with another question, and inquire of them why they have given up the traditional idea of the value of such study. "You seem convinced," let us reply, "that it gives you little. Why is that? Wherein does it fall short?"

Their answers would be various. One would assert that this is the day for action, not for study. Ours is a practical age. We waste time poring over any books: let us be up and doing. If we should remonstrate with such a crude attitude by pointing out that the day is coming in the manufacturing world, and surely also in the religious world, when the intellectually furnished man is going to crowd out all competitors, that efficiency based on scientific study is the watchword of our time—then another objector arises who meets this claim confidently. "True," he concludes, "but why then study the Scriptures? They are excellent in their way, of course, but hardly up to date. The problems they deal with are those of a vanished age. What I want is a knowledge of sociology and psychology. They will at once teach me how to go about my work, and give me inspiration." I well recall a talk I had once in the Library of the University of Pennsylvania with one of its older professors. "The trouble with you ministers," he said (how often such illuminating diagnoses are volunteered!) "is that you waste your time studying theology." "No," I ventured, "but the Bible. That is where we feel we can find most what we and our people need." "Well, then, the Bible," he replied, accepting the challenge. "To my mind the Life of Alexander von Humbolt gives more than the Bible. This age is marked by the triumphs of science, and the men of science are its real inspirers." I give this conversation because it reflects a point of view appearing continually in various forms, but all discrediting the study of Scripture on the ground of its being superseded.

If now, we meet this by declaring that the Bible cannot be superseded, because it deals with the unchanging in us; if we quote Professor Harnack's words to show that one great

scholar at least feels we must still "seek the same sources of strength that our fathers sought," then a third remonstrance is elicited. Years ago an intimate friend admitted to me that he had given up reading the Bible because it did not appeal to him any longer. Most of it he found he knew pretty well already, and it wearied him by its triteness. He was speaking, no doubt, of the Gospels, which he rightly considered the heart of the Book. Probably he would have acknowledged himself less familiar with the Epistles and the Old Testament, but would have viewed a knowledge of the Gospels as enough. His idea was, that he had acquired a sufficient acquaintance with the teachings of Jesus and the principles of our religion to go on with, so why should he read them over and over again? For the inspiration, I urged; but he found them devoid of that for the very reason that he knew them so well. Here once more we find many shades of the same opinion, but all agree on the practical needlessness in their case of Bible study. If sincere Christians justify their neglect of Scripture on any ground, it is apt to be on this.

These three objections, that doing is better than studying, that if we must study we should master more important subjects than the Bible, and that even though the Bible may be important it has little to give to one who possesses a fair acquaintance with the Gospels at least, that he may be more profitably occupied in other things,—are in my experience the main obstacles in the way of really serious people believing that the study of God's Word is indispensable. They do not maintain, mind you, that for those who have time and inclination the reading, marking and learning of Scripture is not an excellent occupation; they merely claim that other pursuits can take its place profitably; that Bible study has nothing to give them which they cannot get better elsewhere.

I think that we who are convinced the Bible should be studied ought to weigh these objections and try to answer them, both to ourselves and to others. For we may be well assured that unless we can demonstrate their falsity; unless we can prove nothing less than that Bible study is indispensable to complete-

ness and full usefulness in the Christian life, it will be crowded out of our busy days. Therefore, our objectors have now the right to turn upon us with their original demand: Declare to us what serious loss we suffer by devoting our time wholly to other things.

Our answer must be, that the loss is cumulative, made up of several losses, all of them serious, but, taken together, fatal to the completeness of Christian character and usefulness. And I hope you will bear in mind that I have such completeness before me when I use the word "indispensable." I repeat, if we have to do with one who is content with less; who counts it a negligible matter if the "man of God" be not "furnished completely unto every good work"; we shall be able to make no strong impression upon his disbelief.

1. The Bible alone in all literature with which I am acquainted possesses the absolute beauty of religious poetry. In its pages one is ever meeting that exquisite fitting of imagination to truth, that clothing of eternal verities in tender yet sublime imagery, that power somehow through the simplest language to strike unforgettable chords of heavenly music within the soul—which is characteristic of all true poetry, but reaches its perfection only here. The Bible has a tone of its own. You cannot mistake it wherever you may meet it. The Hebrew Old Testament, and the New which here builds upon it, have worked out an utter beauty of their own, which may have echoes often in other ancient writings, whose spirit is caught again and again in later literature; yet do these echoes and imitation but bring out the more sharply the unique wonder of the masterpiece itself.

Now, the religious life is born and reared in poetry, it is quickened and sustained by poetry. For poetry alone has the ability to touch the prosaic round of petty duties and the crude facts of experience with a light from the spirit, to paint them with the brush of loving insight. Poetry gives that interpretation of the world which makes it worth the living in nobly. You cannot do without the vision of beauty if your steps are not to flag. The land of poetry is the heart's home, and the home-

sickness it feels unknowingly when shut out therefrom is depressing to its higher energies of affection. However immersed we may be in action or intellectual pursuits, a note of poetry finds us like the sound of our mother tongue in a strange country. Let a public speaker recite unexpectedly a line or two of a real poem and watch the sudden deeper hush that falls upon his audience. Before that melody all bars go down, it reaches the soul's holy of holies in an instant. Especially is this the case where the poet voices the highest truths of all, those that have to do with God and the human heart. These are seen to be the most intimate, for no beauty so belongs to us, is so ourselves, as moral beauty; nor is there any relation so close or so profound as that between man and God, and that second like unto it between man and man in the light of the Father's House.

All this the writers of the Bible understood. They felt that poetry is the natural language of religion, and that if they could employ it truly they would win men to God. I do not mean that they realised this in any detached way, nor went to work upon it as we set out to use a law we have discovered. Rather, they divined it by intuition, by the fact that their own thoughts of God and man took naturally this form of imaginative diction. But however they came at their task, we perceive that they did actually elaborate a perfect vehicle of expression, with capacity to touch the emotion and quicken the affection, and hence to impel the will to things divine, as no other literature can. We must concede to them art as finished in this respect as the Greeks attained in epic, dramatic and lyric poetry. No one views the prophecies of Isaiah or the Psalms as strains of untutored genius: they stand at the culmination of a long and arduous training continued through centuries. The words of Christ are purest art, least noticed and therefore, most consummate; for it is the rule in art that the first shall be last, and what seems most simple and artless, the very form one would hit upon in the beginning, is reached only at the end.

"The Lord is my shepherd: I shall not want.

He maketh me to lie down in green pastures, he leadeth me beside the still waters. . . ."

He who penned those words understood how to do what no man can do longer. The mould is broken in which they were cast. We can no more reproduce their like than we can compose another *Odyssey* or *Agamemnon*. They are the absolute beauty of religious poetry. And, therefore, they possess power to move the soul as nothing modern can.

If this be true, then he who does not constantly contemplate the masterpieces of the Bible loses a certain lifting up and purifying and enriching of his emotional self, and so a sustaining and enhancement of his character and usefulness that he cannot make good by being occupied in other things. The excuse of familiarity with Scripture also appears less convincing. A friend of mine was once standing before the Venus of Milo in the Louvre, when a lady bustled in, followed by a little group of companions, all evidently his compatriots. "Here it is!" she announced in a tone of satisfaction. There was a brief silence, in which the newcomers gazed upon the priceless relic of antique art. They had little to say: perhaps they were disappointed. At any rate their leader bestirred herself after a moment. "Well," she exclaimed, "we've seen it." And so, out they went. Too often people feel that having once learned by heart, let us say, this Twenty-third Psalm, they are quits with it. Do they not know it? Yes, as they know Handel's Largo, being able to recognize it when it is played. Why then hear it again? One calls them to the window to see the sunset: why go? They know what sunsets look like. The story is told that a certain famous divine excited the amusement of some young people on board ship because he spent hours gazing out over the ocean. Finally one of their number asked him banteringly, "Doctor, what do you see?" "Nothing but God," was the reply.

I have dwelt over long, it may be, upon this thought that Bible study is indispensable because it nourishes the soul with a beauty not to be found elsewhere. Consider now a second point:

2. Bible study gives us the knowledge of a certain incomparable tract of human experience, the religious history of Israel

crowned by that of the day of the Son of Man and the Apostolic Church. It tells us what men did and believed on that stage upon which, despite its smallness, the religious destiny of mankind was being wrought out. I am not speaking merely of the historical books, but of the wealth of information to be gathered as well from Psalms, Proverbs, Prophecies, Writings, Epistles, concerning this greatest chapter of the race's achievement. They exhibit to us how men have acted under the belief in God and how they fared, what was the conduct of others who, knowing God, yet went against His will, and what the result of their course; what thoughts and purposes and ideals have proven good in religion and what have brought ruin. No one can afford to do without the experience of others if he expects to work effectively; his own is too provincial, too infinitesimal to be his guide. He must draw on the accumulated findings of the race. That is what takes place when one learns a profession like medicine, for instance: he studies years to appropriate what others have discovered, and he must keep in touch with what new facts experience is bringing daily to light among his colleagues. When he has a perplexing case, your conscientious physician will consult his fellow workers through their books, as to what they have found effective for similar symptoms. How much more in the life of the soul should we seek to learn of our brethren what each has proven for himself. And what I maintain is, that the religious experience of which the Bible is a record stands above any other tract of religious experience in its power to inform and direct us. What can the Christian get in the literature of today, or of any day, that can approach Scripture in this respect? Not that the genuine religious experience has ceased, for its volume has on the contrary been infinitely augmented and it is as real as ever. It has its place and can do for us what the Bible cannot. The biography of Henry Martin brings home the meaning of the Christian life to us in a more arresting, unescapable way than even the Gospels, because it portrays what a man under circumstances nearer ours than circumstances could be in first century Palestine, conceived it to be and so lived it. Modern psychology, again, can illumine Christian experience in helpful fashion, as Pro-

fessor James' well known book shows. But after all must we not concede to the Hebrew people that exclusive genius for religion which makes their experience the norm for later ages? Moreover, in the Bible this experience is set forth in so fresh and living a way, it is so thrust forward, all other interests being forgotten, its lessons are so plainly, yet so captivately, expounded, that the impression it makes upon us is unique.

Take, for example, the story of Jerusalem's deliverance from Sennacherib. What a commentary upon much of the talk we hear about us at this moment! No one reading it in a time of war could fail to see its lesson, whether he accept it or no. How the forces clashing today appear in startling familiarity upon that long ago scene. There is triumphant military power. "Let not thy God in whom thou trustest deceive thee, saying, Jerusalem shall not be given into the hand of the king of Assyria. Behold, thou hast heard what the kings of Assyria have done to all lands, by destroying them utterly: and shalt thou be delivered?" There speaks the military man, confident of power to shape the world, taught by the past that any other factors but those he controls may be left out of account. Then you have the misgivings of Hezekiah, the man who would fain repudiate such a doctrine of might, but finds it almost too convincing. "Of a truth, LORD, the kings of Assyria have laid waste the nations and their lands, and have cast their gods into the fire; for they were no gods" (thus he tries to reassure himself), "but the work of men's hands, wood and stone; therefore, they have destroyed them. Now therefore, O LORD our God, save thou us. . . ." And last speaks the prophet, who sees deep down to the truth of history, flinging his scornful defiance in the face of the invading host. "Hast thou not heard how I have done it long ago, and formed it of ancient times? Now have I brought it to pass that it should be thine to lay waste fortified cities into ruinous heaps—But I know thy sitting down, and thy going out, and thy coming in, and thy rage against me. Because of thy raging against me, and because thine arrogancy is come up into mine ears, therefore will I put my hook in thy nose, and my bridle in thy lips, and I will turn thee back by the way which thou comest." So on rushes the drama till its

sudden close, when the prophet is found to be right. In that chapter the reader sees the present revealed, with the key to unlock its problem. Of course, he may question the miracle of the slaughter of the Assyrians, though from what Herodotus tells us it looks much as if some great disaster did overwhelm Sennacherib's army at the hand of Nature. Certainly, Jerusalem did not fall. But who can deny in the light of history which saw the facts truly—Isaiah or the Assyrian king?

Again, Elijah's experience after his triumph at Carmel is written for our admonition surely when we are inclined to give up the fight for God. What could better remind us of the fact that God does not fail nor become discouraged than the answer of the still small voice to the prophet's despair: "Go, return on thy way . . . anoint Hazael to be king over Syria . . . and Jehu to be king over Israel . . . and Elisha to be prophet in thy room. Yet will I leave me seven thousand in Israel . . . all the knees that have not bowed to Baal and every mouth which hath not kissed him." You see, in all these stories we have the final issue before us, and can know here again that Elijah was wrong, that he was not the only one left, that it was not time to surrender.

I wish I had space to refer to other experiences recorded in the Bible, Jacob's wrestling with the angel, Israel at the Red Sea, Jeremiah facing the great captivity with his prophecy of the return, the testimonies contained in many of the Psalms of persons who tested their religion and found it good. It makes no difference from the point of view of experience whether a story is literally true. Jacob may not have wrestled with the angel, but some one did, else he never would have told it of Jacob. Jonah may not have been angry over the gourd, nor tried to run away from God's command; but he who wrote this of Jonah knew well enough from his own life what he tells of.

Personally, I have come to be so convinced of the superiority of these Bible experiences over others to inform and guide and admonish us that I have ceased to look as I used to for my illustrations in sermons to the newspapers or contemporary life. I thought a while back that the old practice of pointing

one's moral by what David or Ahab did was out of date, that people could no longer be appealed to by such musty examples. We must speak rather of what was said and done yesterday, if we wished to carry conviction to our hearers. Now I feel the modern should be blended with the scriptural, and that the latter should form the preponderating part. Thus the congregation are reminded of Bible history; but much more, they are reached as they are not reached by the vivid happenings of today. The appeal of each kind is different, and each is indispensable for preaching with the fullest power.

Therefore, I say, that he who by study of God's Word has his mind stored ever afresh with the religious experiences of the Bible can bring to bear upon his own case and the cases of his brethren a fund of tested knowledge capable of leading him true and straight to the best workable course, of encouraging him in adversity, of chastening him in complacent hours, of illuminating the present and the principles it involves, of holding him fast to eternal verities, of furnishing him, in a word, unto every good work. And without the study of the Bible I do not see how this can be attained in the same way.

3. Such study alone gives the knowledge of the mind of Christ. I had intended to speak also of the contact it affords with other great personalities, the outstanding religious geniuses of the race; and I think you will agree with me that nowhere but in its pages do you meet a Jeremiah or a Paul. To know them, to be with them, to catch their fire is certainly a privilege we can ill relinquish. To have them as our friends enriches and ennobles us more than we can compute. The Bible reader even more than Southey's scholar can say:

“My days among the dead are past;
Around me I behold,
Where'er these casual eyes are cast,
The mighty minds of old:
My never failing friends are they,
With whom I converse day by day.”

But the pressure of time will permit me to dwell only upon such companionship as the Bible renders possible with the

Master Mind of all. And first, no one should ever tell us unchallenged that modern criticism has shown the unreliability of the Gospel picture of Jesus. One voice of this tenor uttered its plaint in the *Hibbert Journal* for January, 1911. "As a result of the work of the Higher Criticism," wrote one K. C. Anderson, D.D., in that issue, "the four Gospels are a complete wreck as historical records. . . . Why not listen to the mystic that it is nothing less than idolatry to fix our thought and worship on a historical Jesus who is supposed to live in Palestine 2,000 years ago?" Obviously, if that be the case, we cannot behold the mind of Jesus in so faulty a mirror. But it is not the case, if scholars like Harnack be believed. He opened his lectures on "What is Christianity" by asserting that historical criticism since Strauss had succeeded in restoring the credibility of the Gospel in its main outlines. Very true are the words of B. H. Streeter in *Foundations*, p. 78: "Out of the crucible of criticism, kept at white heat by all schools combined, the metal has been poured, and as the moulding sand is brushed away we catch a first glimpse of the finished statue—a portrait of the Master alive and life-transmitting, one which His followers will not need, or rather will not presume to 'defend.' They will only point to it, and 'many will be offended,' but some will 'see God.' . . . And this portrait is no other than that which the ordinary reader, once given the clue, can find for himself in the Gospels."

And that leads me to what I would say next, that the mind of Jesus as revealed in the Gospels is open to all. Early Christian apologists were fond of dilating upon this point, comparing the difficulty of understanding Greek philosophy with the ease with which poor and unlearned men comprehend the New Testament. The common people never have been puzzled over Jesus, though His cross was to the Jews a stumbling block and to the Greeks foolishness.

"He may read who binds the sheaf,
Or builds the house, or digs the grave,
Or those wild eyes that watch the wave
In roarings round the coral reef."

There is possible, then, to the earnest reader of the Synoptic Gospels, if any insist on the exclusion of the Fourth, a personal acquaintance with Jesus our Lord of the same sort as the intimacy we form with other great men in Scripture, only made unutterably more real and powerful by reason of our faith in His Person, and our devotional fellowship with Him. Of course, the study of the Gospels is not the only way of laying hold on Him: far from it! There is the sacramental approach, like that of the diseased woman who cried, "If I touch but His garments I shall be made whole." There is the path of service, where we meet Him in the least of His brethren. But this I speak of is what those Greeks had in mind when they approached Philip with the request, "Sir, we would see Jesus." It lies through the intelligence, however warmed and charged with feeling. It is the grappling of mind on mind. They wanted to converse with Him, to hear Him speak.

Our Lord certainly felt that He had much to give to men by word of mouth for He was ever teaching them. He conceived that association with Himself was necessary for the twelve, for He called them to be with Him. One cannot read the Gospels without receiving the strong impression that He was constantly to mould men to His own way of looking at life, to fashion them anew after His own spirit. The recurrent "Verily, verily, I say unto you," and "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear," are the words of one who would compel men to attention.

It was as Teacher that men knew Him before they called Him Lord. Is He willing, suppose you, to vacate the seat of the Master for the throne of the King? Or does He still ask of us discipleship? Does He still claim His right to inform our minds and enrich our intelligence, to link us to Him by that holy bond of the school? If He were in our synagogue today would He be satisfied to have us kiss His robe in worship, to acclaim Him Lord, to yield Him our service; or would He desire also to take the roll of the book and read to us, then, sitting with all eyes fastened upon Him, to expound its meaning?

Albert Schweitzer said of modern criticism that it had been

afraid to leave the plain man alone with the Gospels. Is it possible that we have been afraid ourselves to be alone with this dread Teacher Who if listened to from the heart may well work such havoc in our comfortable lives?

What is the knowledge of Him and His doctrine possessed by the average Christian? Of a truth it does not go very far, though it may be deep. It is not much greater than the amount of information supplied by the Pauline Epistles, whose paucity of detail concerning the earthly life of Christ has led some to imagine that St. Paul was himself ignorant of more than he lets fall in his passing allusions, that he did not care to know Christ after the flesh, meaning what He did and said among men. That Jesus pleased not Himself, that though He were rich yet for our sakes He became poor, that He humbled himself to become man and died for us, these and similar facts of great and moving beauty, yet somewhat colorless from absence of detail, are about the sum of what Christ means to many who follow Him truly. But St. Paul had no such meager ideal of acquaintance with his Lord. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all knowledge"—nothing less would content him.

Moreover, whole sides of Jesus and of His teachings are apt to escape him who neglects the Gospels. I wish I could pause to remind you how His sternness, for instance, that ever-living fire which slumbered in His breast, ready to leap forth in indignant lightning against what was base, plays no part in the common picture of Him as the Saviour meek and gentle. And I should like to bring out also the ignorance of His practical moral teaching in too many minds, so that they constantly do unchristian things without knowing it. But on the whole I can confidently say that he who imagines that he is already familiar enough with the Gospels to dispense with studying them is probably sadly mistaken.

But even if he is right as to his acquaintance, surely each time he rereads the Beatitudes, let us say, he ought to find a depth and freshness in them greater than before. For though they do not change, he does. We and our needs, our emphases, our affections, alter day by day. And Jesus has a message

for each day, yes, each hour. There are two great Teachers who must continually work together over our slow education; the one is Christ, and the other is Life. The open Gospel and the onward step, these should not be separated. So the Gospel will prove always new, like God's other mercies. The onward step we must take whether we will or no. The years come and go of themselves. But only the study of the Gospel will bring it about that as we grow in years we shall grow, I say not in grace, but at least in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Yes, we can make no mistake in taking those four little books as our viaticum as we fare ever onward in our pilgrimage. They will not disappoint our affection, seeing that they give us Him in the knowledge of whom standeth our eternal life. Well did the two English scholars place on the opening page of their great edition of the Greek New Testament the words of Erasmus written four hundred years ago:

"The writings of others are such that not a few who have begun to study them have repented that they have done so. But happy he whom death overtakes as he meditates in these scriptures! These, therefore, let us all thirst for, these let us embrace, in these ever let us live, these let us love, in these at last let us die, into these let us be transformed, since indeed our studies pass over into character. . . . These render unto thee the living image of that most holy mind, and put before thee Christ Himself speaking, healing, dying, rising again, in fine, the whole Christ—so present, that thou wouldst see Him less plainly if thou didst behold Him with thine eyes."

May God grant that among us and in our age men and women, youths and maidens may with all their learning learn the Scriptures that are able to make them wise unto salvation through faith that is in Christ Jesus as no other writings can, and that now as never before the "Word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified."

The Russian Sects

BY CLARENCE AUGUSTUS MANNING, PH.D.

WE often speak as if Christianity was cleft in twain by the division popularly speaking of all believers into those who are members of the historic Church and those who belong to separated bodies. These latter are, of course, the Protestants and represent the sects which appeared in western Europe during the sixteenth century and since. Yet these sects form only one part of the Christian bodies which have severed all connection with the Church. Protestantism is a reaction or a revolt against Rome and the Anglican Communion but it is perhaps not so widely known that the Orthodox Church has itself the task of dealing with many bodies of large membership which may perhaps be termed Eastern Protestants, although one must confess that many of these strange religious systems could scarcely be dignified with the name of Christian unless we are willing to accord the same honor to such weird bodies among us as the "Holy Ghosters," the Mormons, and similar organizations.

These sects have developed to a great extent in Russia and it is far from impossible that votaries of strange and incomprehensible rites may have assisted in the creation of the present chaos. No one is able to give an accurate account of many of the bodies which rise, blossom, and sink back into insignificance or disappear completely, only to make way for others equally removed from the Catholic religion and the faith of the Fathers.

The earliest of these sects which became important arose in the fourteenth century. In the city of Pskov appeared a sect known as the Strigolniks. The central point of this body as of most of the separatists was a denial of the Church and of the priesthood. The believers laid great stress on the duty of confession to God and so they dispensed completely with the Sacrament of Penance. It was finally suppressed, when the Patriarch of Constantinople sent to Russia a letter condemning it.

More surprising and more dangerous to the Russian Church was the sect of the Judaizers. In 1471 a Jew by the name of Skharia went from either Kiev or Lithuania to the great commercial center of Novgorod in the north of Russia and speedily began to collect around him a band of followers. In some uncertain manner he gained the support of some of the prominent clergy and later of the niece of the tsar himself. The influence of the sect increased so rapidly that a member of it, Zosima, even became Metropolitan of Moscow. Councils were held in 1490 and again in 1504 which condemned the heretics largely through the relentless opposition of St. Joseph Volotsky, one of the great figures of the mediaeval Russian Church. Undoubtedly the ignorance of the clergy and the generally wretched condition of the people as a result of the Tartar invasions contributed to the spread of this heresy but after all possible allowances are made, the failure of the Christians to maintain their religion in this case is remarkable. For instance, the followers of this new doctrine denied the existence of the Trinity and maintained that the Messiah had not yet come. They rejected the church, the priesthood, the sacraments, the use of crosses and ikons, the reverence for the saints, but especially they ridiculed the Incarnation. Many of them accepted circumcision and celebrated the Passover.

This heresy, however, caused the preparation of the first complete translation of the Bible into Russian Church Slavonic. Before that time large sections of the Bible, especially those parts which were used in the services of the Church, were in general circulation among all who were able to read but many of the people were influenced very largely by sacred poems and popular and metrical versions of various portions of the Scriptures and sacred stories. The Judaizing heresy appealed especially to the educated classes in the community and since they constantly appealed to the Bible, the Orthodox Church completed the translation of the complete Canon of Holy Scripture. The parts which were needed were largely the books of the Apocrypha, and several of these were translated from the Latin of the Vulgate instead of from the Greek and for at least one book,

Esther, the scholars employed the Hebrew text. The metropolitan Gennady who superintended this work was assisted among others by a Dominican Slav Benjamin and Dimitry Gerasimov, a learned Slav who was familiar with Latin.

St. Joseph Volotsky, the foremost and most consistent opposer of this heresy, was a good product of the theological education of his times. For instance, he was thoroughly versed in the Bible and rarely needed to consult the text. One time when he was in a monastery, where there were not all the necessary books, he held the services for three years and read all the Epistles and Gospels and all the selections of Psalms from memory. He represented the sterner school of thought and was especially desirous of having the civil government co-operate in the task of exterminating heresy. Naturally he resisted the final move of the heretics after their condemnation by the councils. This was an attempt to save themselves from any censure by emphasizing the text: "Judge not, that ye be not judged."

Still later Maksim Bakshin (or Bashkin) attempted as Leo Tolstoy so many years later to emphasize the softer side of the Gospel and work against law and order by advocating the love and consequently the exemption of punishment of all. Later he recanted and attributed his heresy to the evil influence exercised upon him by certain Latin teachers.

As a result of the general fall in education during the dark ages of Russia, the service books had become very corrupt but these errors had taken upon themselves the appearance of sanctity and if a passage could not be understood, it was commonly supposed that a very holy meaning lay concealed in it. The more enlightened of the Russian theologians wished to correct these books but it was long before it became possible. Finally in the seventeenth century, during the patriarchate of Nikon, the work commenced. The result was disastrous. Large sections of Russia immediately seceded from the Orthodox Church and organized new bodies known as the Old Believers or the Raskol as it is often called. It is to be noted that whereas in the Western Church the schisms took place because the author-

ities were not sufficiently radical to please the reformers, in the East the reverse happened and the sects claimed to represent the true old tradition. Most of these differences which were corrected were relatively slight, such as the number of times which the Alleluias were to be said and the manner in which the sign of the cross was to be made.

Soon after new schisms took place within the Raskol. Some of the parts desiring to retain the priesthood employed clergy who had been condemned and deposed by the Orthodox Church. Others claimed that the act of Nikon and consequently of the whole patriarchate of Moscow had annihilated for good and all the sacred priesthood in the world and commenced to fashion their doctrines so as to ignore this misfortune. Others again continued in their meetings such services as Baptism which could be celebrated by the laity. The general confusion became worse after the reforms of Peter, for the Old Believers refused to accept his reforms and proclaimed the tsar to be Antichrist. Then they interpreted the Book of Revelation to apply to the conditions of that time and discovered that the council which had firmly approved the books took place in 1666 and so was undoubtedly meant by the number six hundred sixty and six of the Apocalypse. Others considered by devious methods of reckoning that Russia was the same as Assyria and was to receive all the plagues which God had promised to lay upon that sinful and disobedient country. The seriousness of the situation which had been created can be seen from the fact that Stephen Yavorsky, the ecclesiastic on whom Peter relied very largely, was compelled to write a book on the signs of Antichrist, so as to show that they did not apply to the tsar.

Milder treatment was later accorded to these sectaries and during the nineteenth century some of them were able to procure again the order of the episcopate from a deposed Uniat Greek Catholic bishop. Here again peace was not achieved, because many of the sectaries after two centuries of freedom from ecclesiastical restraint did not desire again to be subject to regularly constituted authorities. Others again and these among the more patriotic objected to the foreign origin of the

hierarchy which had been obtained and held aloof from it. Meanwhile the Orthodox Church had developed a class of uniats as we may call them, people who held to some of the non-heretical tenets of the Raskol but who were willing to worship with the Orthodox.

But what of the sects which had remained completely without clergy and which had accepted the belief either that there were no more properly ordained priests in the world or that priests were entirely unnecessary? These bodies often developed into the wildest of barbaric cults and apparently some of them have been known to practice human sacrifice and to commit suicide so as to join Christ. Others, of course, did not go to such lengths and became more or less analogous to the eminently proper and respectable Protestant sects of the west.

Many of these bodies have passed through the same intellectual processes apparently as have the sects of the West. Thus many of them denounce as sinful all use of the sign of the cross and all reference to the saints and the sacraments.

Some of them are even rationalistic or if not rationalistic, so profoundly mystical that the final result is that their dogmas seem to represent the reverse of those common here. For instance much of modern scholarship, particularly where it is of a destructive nature, would deny that Christ had raised Lazarus from the dead. If Lazarus was restored to his sisters, it could only be because he was in a swoon. The Russian sectary would reason thus. Christ insisted so strongly upon the reality of the spiritual life that he undoubtedly convinced Mary and Martha that their brother was alive with God in heaven. In either case the same result is ultimately obtained,—Christ did not raise Lazarus from the dead.

One of the great difficulties in obtaining accurate knowledge about these cults lay in the fact that many of their adherents were outwardly at least devout members of the Orthodox Church. They would attend the celebration of the Liturgy and then later in the day attend their own meeting. This worked out much as in England during the time when the Test Act was in operation and many of the Protestants used to receive

the Blessed Sacrament without being at heart members of the Anglican Church. Very probably now that the Russian revolution seems to have separated church and state, we may have a new and open development of these cults, although it is to be hoped that they will not be as unbridled as in the past, when it was often necessary for the government to interfere in the interests of public peace and order.

Some of the doctrines which have been developed by these sects are amusing. Thus there are bodies which consider smoking as a sinful act and one which drives out the Holy Ghost as smoke from a man's soul, basing their doctrine on St. Mark VII, 15. Then there is a sect the members of which hold their mouths open for a time on Maundy Thursday so that they can be fed by the angels who pity men, because there are no more true priests on the earth. Other sects are pacifistic and before the Russian Revolution several members of one of these non-resistant bodies, the Tolstoyans, were arrested by the Government for anti-war activities. Then other sects are akin to the Quakers and Shakers with which we in America are more or less familiar.

Strangest of all are a few sects which have a peculiar Jewish tinge. Ever since the days of the Judaizers in the fifteenth century, there have been small groups of people who were not Jews but who celebrated the Passover, practiced circumcision, and in a few cases used Hebrew as an ecclesiastical language.

Lastly, there are the peculiarly Protestant sects created under the influence of Western Protestantism. Such are the Stundists and the "Evangelicals." The Baptists have been especially prominent in this work, although these imported religious bodies have not yet perhaps attained so widespread distribution among the peasants as some of the sects of native origin. In the upper classes of society, of course, we find many adherents of these sects and of the "Evangelical" teaching. It is interesting in this connection to note that at the end of Leo Tolstoy's novel, "Resurrection," the hero is aroused to a sense of his Christian duty by the present of a Gospel from an English preacher and he accordingly sees where his duty lies and that he can dispense with the church.

It is, of course, clear that many of these sects are fundamentally non-Christian. Some of them may represent pre-Christian beliefs and others again have been influenced by Judaism or Mohammedanism, which numbers many millions of followers in Russia, especially among the Tartar tribes. Some of the Old Believers, particularly the more conservative portions and those which still believe in the priesthood, whether they acknowledge the irregular hierarchy which they have obtained or not, may perhaps be won back to the Church. These bodies are in many cases well organized and are well equipped for certain kinds of charitable work. Thus they have large orphan asylums and similar institutions. The others, however, cannot be treated in any other way than that in which we would deal with the more extreme and emotional types of religious thought in the United States. They form, however, a big problem for the Orthodox Church, especially since their members and friends number several millions. Yet, so far, there is little real unity among them and they rise and fall with few to mark or heed.

The Orthodox Church has attempted to stamp out these sects and to convert them. This has proven a difficult task, because of the great size of Russia and the secrecy with which many of the services are carried on. Their influence is shown by the fact that Rasputin who played such a part in the events leading up to the downfall of the royal family, was almost certainly an adherent of one of the wilder sects, the Flagellants. It is hard to say what effect the Revolution will have upon them but it is possible that they may multiply even more rapidly than in the past. As religious bodies and particularly as Christian bodies, we may perhaps consider them quite unimportant but their main interest for us lies in the fact that in the Orthodox East there have developed religious bodies apart from the Church and claiming to be on a higher spiritual level than it but with many of their less novel ideas those to which we have long been accustomed. These Russian sects furnish good evidence, if evidence were needed, that whatever be the form and ritual, the number of heresies possible is after all quite limited and that the same types recur in all portions of the Christian world and indeed at all times and ages.

The American Church Monthly

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

11 WEST 45TH STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

President: GEORGE A. ARMOUR, Princeton, N. J.

Vice-President: GUY VAN AMRINGE, 31 Nassau Street, New York

Secretary: THE REV. CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York

Treasurer: HALEY FISKE, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Business Manager: EDWIN S. GORHAM, 11 West 45 Street, New York

Editor: SELDEN PEABODY DELANY, D.D.

Two Dollars a Year

Canadian subscription, \$2.25 a Year

Twenty cents a Copy

Foreign subscription, \$2.50 a Year

Volume III

JULY, 1918

Number 5

Mr. Cleveland Moffett and the Church

MR. CLEVELAND MOFFETT believes that physical culture is the royal road to efficiency. As efficiency is necessary to make America victorious, he thinks that the churches can render their highest patriotic service to the nation by affording their people greater opportunities for physical culture. He advocates that the churchyards be converted into playgrounds; that the churches be used for popular lectures, concerts, motion pictures, and evening classes; and that the assembly rooms connected with the churches be devoted to physical culture classes and dancing. By means of these dance halls he anticipates that every church will soon become a matrimonial agency, and thus render further patriotic service by helping to eradicate our great national vice of birth-control.

Mr. Moffett says it is "wickedly inefficient" for so many of our churches to be closed and silent more than half the time. Therefore he feels justified in making the following threat:

"Let it be remembered that the church buildings of America, over 200,000 of them, belong absolutely to the people of this country. They were built by the people's contributions. They are free from taxation (with a total estimated value of three billion dollars) by the people's favor. Therefore any activities calculated to benefit the

people and give them reasonable pleasure are legitimate within their walls; particularly any activities, like physical culture work, that are calculated to make us more efficient as defenders of the nation."

We had supposed that the churches had been consecrated to God, and therefore belonged to Him; but that is doubtless too mediaeval a view.

Our sympathy was aroused for Mr. Moffett some time ago when he was arrested for interrupting a seditious soap-box orator on Broadway. We still cannot help sympathizing with him, because he so evidently means well, and his ideas of the churches are so obviously biased by an exclusively Protestant outlook. Naturally he would feel that a church, which is open only on Sunday, and even then is not regarded as any more hallowed or sacred than a concert hall or lecture room, should be utilized for other purposes on the other six days of the week. Apparently he knows nothing about a church that is always open, and that enshrines the hidden Presence of the Saviour of the world, so that at any time the weary and the heavy-laden may enter and find rest for their souls. Doubtless it would be difficult for him to understand how one prayer, said by an ignorant scrub-woman in a dimly lighted church, may be of more avail for the young manhood of America than all the gymnasiums and all the dancehalls in the land.

We regret that we cannot share Mr. Moffett's unbounded faith in physical culture. We had supposed that the gospel of salvation through dancing had been tried and found wanting. Mr. Moffett's criticism of the Church seems like a voice out of the distant past, in the days before the war.

Loyalty to Our Spiritual Tasks

IT is very easy in the midst of so tremendous a world cataclysm as the present to lose sight of spiritual realities, and to measure our needs and aims entirely in the terms of the material world. The whole nation is being urged continually to throw its whole effort into the work of winning the war. This is commonly taken to mean that we must concentrate our atten-

tion upon training men for the army and navy; keeping them supplied with food and clothing, arms and munitions; building and manning the ships that are needed; and helping to feed and clothe our allies.

Those who are not directly engaged in some of these war activities, such as the clergy and other church workers, are likely to feel that their work is of little consequence in the present distress, and that therefore they ought to reduce their own activities to a minimum. They feel almost like apologizing for using their energies in doing work for the Church. Some of them are beginning to question whether it would not be more patriotic to reduce the missionary work of the Church to the lowest terms, cut down the working staffs in all our parishes, eliminate all of the Church's charities, and urge people to give their money instead to the Red Cross and the Y. M. C. A.

Would it not be well for us to remember that we are in this war largely because we believe in the spiritual values of life? We are not willing that they should be replaced by the materialistic ideals of Prussian militarism; by the worship of an all-powerful, unmoral state; and by the kind of right that is made only by might. How the devil would rejoice if in preparing ourselves to do battle for the higher ideals of the spirit, we should throw away our own spiritual ideals, and should become a nation wholly given over to things material! There is real danger of our falling into this snare unless we guard more jealously the position and power of the Church, and unless we insist that the Church shall increase rather than diminish her activities.

Napoleon is said to have maintained that in a great national emergency things spiritual count in comparison with things material as four to one, and that the moral force behind and within a man is of much greater value in the end than physical or brute force. If he was right, then the clergy and all who love the Church may rest assured that there is still much for them to do at their posts of duty at home. If the call plainly comes from God for them to go to France, then let them by all means go as soon as possible. If not, the present crisis is simply a call from God to redouble our efforts among the peo-

ple at home. We must inspire and encourage the young men who go forth into the conflict, we must sympathize with those who are left behind and stimulate them to make their sacrifices willingly and cheerfully, we must comfort the sorrowful and bereaved, we must stimulate patriotism and fill our people with zeal for bearing the burdens of the war until victory is won, we must minister to the spiritual needs of all and keep them in constant touch with God, and above all we must be men of prayer and like Moses on the mount hold up our hands until the enemy has been vanquished. There is plenty for us to do. Let us be loyal to the tasks that God has laid upon us.

A Common Difficulty in Preaching

IN criticizing the clergy for their sermons, the laity would do well to bear in mind that the average congregation is made up of two distinctly different classes of people, who are as far asunder spiritually as the poles. These two classes may be designated as the natural man and the spiritual man.

The spiritual man has been regenerated in baptism by being brought into vital union with Jesus Christ. He may have fallen away through sin, but if he has truly repented he has been restored again by the grace of God; and in the main he is now trying to walk in the ways of true discipleship, and as the years go on he is being progressively enlightened by the Spirit of God. Through the Holy Spirit he is favored with that secret wisdom which enables him to understand and appreciate the blessings which are mediated through Christ, in fact all "the deep things of God."

The natural man is the man who has never been brought into the covenanted sphere of the Spirit's operations, or the man who has been regenerated but has not lived up to the obligations of his new inheritance. Many nominal Christians belong to this class. They have been baptized, confirmed, and they occasionally receive the Holy Communion. These sacraments, however, mean nothing to them but outward forms. Probably the majority of the average fashionable Sunday morning congregations are people of this type. S. Paul says of

them: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

Obviously it is no simple feat of eloquence to preach to a congregation made up of two such radically different types of men and women. One may, of course, address himself wholly to the natural man. In that case one might preach a sermon that would lend itself admirably to being reported in the Monday morning papers. Such a preacher would no doubt win encomiums for his sound common sense; people would say that there was no nonsense about *him*, and that he preached the sort of things that everybody could understand. Yes, but how about the faithful and devout Christians in his congregation who look up to him Sunday after Sunday, and are not fed? Their plight would seem to be somewhat pathetic. After all there is some obligation resting upon the clergy "to feed and provide for the Lord's family."

On the other hand it would hardly seem fair to address oneself only to the spiritually minded members of one's flock. No priest would want to repel men who were simply nominal Christians, nor make the church appear inhospitable to the unbeliever and the unconverted. Some sermons at least in their entirety, and some parts of every sermon, must be in language that the natural man can understand. Perhaps the ideal way would be that the sermon at the Eucharist should be intended primarily for the faithful; while there would be other services for the careless and the unconverted, consisting mainly of hymns and a few prayers to prepare the way for the sermon. It hardly needs to be said that a monastic office like matins or evensong is not adapted to such an occasion.

A Heritage from Charles Péguy

AMONG the many brilliant young Frenchmen of genius whom the war has snatched from us in their prime, none was more distinguished and none bore greater promise than Charles Péguy. A lieutenant of reserve infantry, he laid down his life

for France and humanity early in the war in September, 1914, at the battle of the Marne. The philosophical writings he has left us reveal a mind of unusual insight. The following words, quoted by Pierre de Lanux in his "Young France and New America," are capable of a wide application in matters of religion as well as of philosophy:

"The true philosopher knows that he is not standing opposing his adversary, but beside his adversary and others, facing a reality always greater and more mysterious.

"And this even the true physician knows. That he is not standing opposing his rival physician, but beside him, facing a nature always more profound and more mysterious."

These words contain a valuable lesson for scholars and leaders of thought within the Church,—a lesson that once learned would smooth the way toward the unity of all Christian people. Why need any of us regard men of other schools of churchmanship, or members of other Christian communions as adversaries to be opposed? Why may we not rather stand beside one another, and face together the eternal realities, the mysteries of the universe, and the clamorous needs of humanity? Surely the task of setting up the Kingdom of God in this world is sufficiently vast, and the opposing forces of evil sufficiently strong, to require the attention and energy of all men of good will; and it ill becomes those upon whom God has laid so overwhelming a responsibility to turn and rend one another!

BOOK REVIEWS

Values of the Christian Life. By Alfred Davenport Kelly, M.A., Society of the Sacred Mission. With a preface by the Rev. William Temple. Macmillan Co., 1917, \$2.50.

This is just the kind of a book many of the clergy are looking for, which will suggest to them subjects for sermons, or the proper treatment of a subject already in mind. If a priest were planning to preach on prayer, or grace, or the Ascension of Christ, or the Eucharist, for example—he could not do better than look up the subject in this book. He would find the traditional Catholic view of the subject clearly stated, and various modern objections met and answered; and the whole thing is done in so refreshingly modern a way, that it is extremely suggestive and helpful.

After certain preliminaries dealing with devotion or loyalty to the Christian claims, the author takes up some imperfect objects of devotion, such as self-perfection and duty for duty's sake. He then sets forth the claims of God as the only object of perfect devotion. He shows that trust in God, the hope of heaven, and the fear of God are essential parts of our true welfare. In the next section on "The Claims of Christ," he considers our Lord as the means of knowledge and the means of grace. Then follow sections setting forth the claims of the Church, of the Sacraments, and of Religious Practices, such as prayer, confession, meditation, and the use of the Bible. The last section of the book treats more exhaustively some of the more difficult subjects already dealt with, such as authority, the atonement, faith, and spiritual experience.

The book is an admirable combination of the dogmatic statement of religious truth and its defense against modern attacks. It is written simply throughout, and any intelligent layman could read it with pleasure and profit. At the same time it is scholarly and thorough, as one might expect from the prefatory commendation of the Rev. William Temple.

The Great Thousand Years. By Ralph Adams Cram, Litt.D., LL.D. Boston, Marshall Jones Co., 1918, \$1.00.

This little book contains an essay under the above title, written in the year 1908, and first printed in *Pax*, the magazine of the Benedictines of Caldey, in 1910; and a commentary thereon written in 1918, and called "Ten Years After." The former essay is an extraordinary bit of prophesying, which at the time it first appeared was commonly disregarded as the foolish speculation of an eccentric genius. The prophecy has now come

true. The second essay is a striking estimate of "modern civilization" as it has come to its perfect fruition in Prussian materialism. Dr. Cram holds that "Kultur" was an "idea magnificent in its working out; the important point, however, is that it is undeniably the awful thing predicted from of old, and that is, Antichrist."

Jesus and the Eucharist. By the Rev. J. P. Wilson, M.A., C.F., Rector of Hedenham, Norfolk. New York, The Macmillan Co., \$1.35 net.

This is an earnest plea that the Eucharist may occupy its proper place as the very centre of our religion.

In Part I, entitled God and the Soul, the author insists on experience or actual first-hand knowledge of God as the great religious need, "the aim must be to bring the soul into contact and communication with the Living Presence . . . all the energies and actions of our being engaged in converse with God."

The Second Part speaks of the lure of the Holy Name Jesus, and more directly of the Eucharist as the expression of His universal Presence "brought to a focus and flashing into fire in this act of special ordering, along with faith in the recipient. It is the Gospel in action. We repent; we draw nigh; we unite ourselves with Angels and Archangels and with all the company of heaven; we show the Lord's death; we offer ourselves, soul and body to God's service. In the Gloria in Excelsis we sing the song of the Ascension before the throne of God and the Lamb. Full of peace and blessing we go back to our daily work." The religion of the Incarnation is very beautifully explained to be essentially sacramental in its method, and the author finds also in the Eucharist our best hope of reunion, the Eucharist is the service of Evangelical love, and love will find a way.

The concluding pages contain a Retrospect from the year 1950 of Church and State regenerated under the chastening influences of the great war.

This book will be helpful and encouraging to the large number of clergy who desire to recover the Eucharist as the chief act of worship of their people.

W. H. B.

Letters to the Mother of a Soldier. By Richardson Wright. New York, F. A. Stokes Company, \$1.00 net.

Now that we are beginning to realize more clearly every day what the war means and why we are in it, this Mother's Manual of Arms will bring comfort and assurance to many whose sons are in training or at

the front with its suggestions of practical helpfulness. To take a few samples from these kindly letters—"The invulnerable armor which you must wear in these days is unfailing belief in the righteousness of our cause. . . . Keep yourself in the best possible health. . . . Do not overdo war activities. Have other interests. . . . Carry your head high, . . . be a Spartan mother, . . . Spartan mothers may never have shed tears, but I am sure they must have prayed." We think it precarious, however, to assert that a recklessly wicked life is atoned for by a heroic death on the battlefield, pp. 60-64.

On pages 90-94 are to be found the address given his men of the Expeditionary Force by Lord Kitchener, and strangest of all the order issued to the Russian Army called "The Soldier's Memento," a mixture of piety and practical advice which sheds a light on the Russian Army that used to be and the deep fire of religion that drove its men to Titanic sacrifices.

These letters are a suitable handbook of courage for those who are tempted to despondency and doubt.

W. H. B.

The Minister's Son, A Record of His Achievements. By the Rev. C. E. N. Macartney. Philadelphia, Eakins, Palmer & Harrar.

This is not a novel, but a little book of 28 pages by a Presbyterian Minister of Philadelphia wherein he has no difficulty in gravely establishing his thesis that the son of a minister is not *ipso facto* predestined to perdition. Why should that be thought a thing incredible? Eli and his sons are not, we trust, typical of the Manse.

An interesting catalogue of names is given—and many more could be added, from President Wilson onwards, of ministers' sons who have achieved greatness and exerted influence in the life of their country. Thomas Fuller wisely wrote that "Clergymen's children have not been more unfortunate, but more observed than the children of parents of other professions." Our own experience of life (not "Life") inclines us to believe that the minister's son is after all a chip of the old block. We catch a glimpse of unconscious Scotch humor as we read "The minister's home is an answer to the wise man's prayer 'Give me neither riches nor poverty.' He never gets riches, sometimes he gets poverty, . . . Clergymen do not usually possess enough wealth to allow their children to live in idleness." But here is the gist of the whole matter, "the chief thing is the Christian training of the home." We should like to see some mention of the mysterious force of mother love as a factor in the development of character. Who will write about the "Minister's Wife's Son"?

W. H. B.

American Pictures and Their Painters. By Lorinda Munson Bryant. With 230 illustrations. John Lane and Company, Publishers.

In "American Paintings and Their Painters," by Miss Lorinda Munson Bryant we have a book more useful than ambitious. Presenting as it does some two hundred illustrations it is categorical rather than critical. The text is an interesting commentary on the painters, anecdotal and readable. Much praise may be given to the selection and reproduction of the examples of American art and the book ought to find wide use among those to whom extensive collections are inaccessible, for the turning of its pages will give a certain acquaintance with painting from Benjamin West to Arthur B. Davis (not to speak of Morgan Russell) that pages of description could not impart. Its range covers nearly two hundred years and to turn from West's "Death on a White Horse" on the first page to Mr. Zorach's "Spring" (also on a white horse) on the last gives one something of a jolt, which the antithesis of subject and the similarity of symbolism only increase. Indeed the contrasting of these two pictures will throw much light on the latest movement in art. Although the figures in Mr. Zorach's "Spring" are worse than death, and his white horse has a black tail one cannot fail to find a clearer expression of Spring amid its absurdities than one does of Death in the chaotic classicism of West. Nevertheless Miss Bryant treats the moderns without partisanship and with sympathy, leaving their pictures and the quotations from their writings to speak for them and leaving the reader to decide whether their art spells lunacy or renaissance. The book would not be misplaced in an artist's library and would be most interesting to an amateur.

H. V. M.

A History of the Christian Church. By Williston Walker, D.D., pp. 634. New York, 1918, Charles Scribner's Sons, Price \$3.00 net.

This is a very useful summary of the history of the Church. On the whole, with some exceptions, we can accept and endorse the positions taken by the author, who is the leading Protestant Church historian in this country. Most of the great epochs have been treated adequately and fairly. We consider Dr. Walker's treatment of the great schism between the Eastern and the Western Church as absolutely inadequate, in view of the great importance of the event itself, and especially in view of its bearing on the efforts to effect a reunion of, at any rate, the Anglican and the Eastern Orthodox Churches. The history of the great

doctrines of the Church is well told, and the rise of the Papacy is traced with accuracy and fairness, and without the antagonism unfortunately too often manifested by Protestant writers. Naturally, the author is deeply interested in the Protestant Reformation, the history of which is described most adequately and with deep sympathy. We note, also, that the Anglican Reformation has been given fair treatment, and that in the discussion of the so-called Puritan Reformation, the author shows little, if any, bias against the mother Church.

We dissent from much in the opening sections of the book. We still accept the views of the great conservative scholars who established the dates of the Synoptic Gospels as all earlier than 70 A.D., despite the fact that present day New Testament Critics would put them all later than that date. Nor can we accept the author's view that the Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul are, in their entirety, anything but the genuine letters of that Apostle. The section on the organization of the early Church is unsatisfactory to a Catholic, and naturally so, as it is written from the Protestant viewpoint. Yet the author is compelled to admit that "the monarchical episcopate," as he calls it, existed in the days of St. Ignatius, early in the second century, or within about a decade of the death of St. John, the Divine.

Apart from these major faults and some minor inaccuracies that we have not the space to note, this volume may be accepted as generally correct in its statements. The perspective, on the whole, is good. A useful, though not absolutely adequate, bibliography and a copious index add to the value of the volume.

F. C. H. W.

The Church in the Furnace. Essays by Seventeen Temporary Church of England Chaplains on Active Service in France and Flanders. Edited by F. B. MacNutt, Senior Chaplain to the Forces, Canon of Southwark. Macmillan & Co., 1918, \$1.75.

This book sets before the world a very severe arraignment of the Church of England; and yet strangely enough it is written by priests who are devoted servants of the Church and wish to be perfectly loyal to their spiritual mother. Just because they love her, they yearn to see her blemishes removed and her deficiencies made up.

The contributions of these chaplains supply the most carefully considered and the most stimulating comment on spiritual matters that the war has brought forth. They say all that was said by Donald Hankey and a great deal more; and what they say comes with more compelling

emphasis, because it is the combined judgment of educated and experienced priests. Naturally these essays are of unequal value, though all of them are clearly and forcibly written and contain passages that are both inspiring and illuminating. Especially helpful and suggestive are the papers on "Membership and Loyalty," by the Rev. Geoffrey Gordon; on "Worship and Services," by the Rev. E. Milner-White; and on "Instruction in Prayer," by the Rev. Marcell W. T. Conran, S.S.J.E.

In the section dealing with Faith, we learn that the war has not resulted in a revival of religion, as we are so often told by popular preachers. It has administered a tremendous shaking to conventional religion, and only the things that cannot be shaken will remain. The traditional idea of God has been found to be lamentably inadequate; what one writer calls "this nebulous Theism" has failed utterly to give men what they need. The only kind of God that will appeal to the soldiers in France is the God that is presented in terms of Jesus Christ, the God who suffered upon the Cross. That God is marching on to victory, to the complete establishing of His Kingdom in this world; and though there are many enemies to be overcome, yet the young men of to-day are glad to enlist in that campaign. Aside from this belief in the suffering Messiah who is trying to establish His Kingdom, there are other beliefs that have been quickened and reinforced by the experiences of the war such as the beliefs in prayer, in sin, in the sacramental view of life, and in the reality of the life hereafter.

In the section on Fellowship, we discover, as we might have expected, that the war has broken down many of the barriers that have heretofore kept men apart, such as partisanship, social distinctions, and suspicion between the clergy and the laity. Ecclesiastical partisanship, we are glad to learn, has been conspicuous by its absence. Circumstances have altered many prejudices. The following passage (p. 114) is a good illustration of the way in which prejudices have melted away:

It is not merely discipline which has checked aberrations, and brought men almost to a common use; it is the force of circumstances which has guided many chaplains to administer the Eucharist at any hour of the day or night, in order that men under great pressure of work, or in daily peril of their lives, might not be deprived of the opportunity of making their Communion. It was a man who normally would advocate fasting Communion who, before his battalions went into action on the Somme, went round evening by evening to each company in turn, holding service, and celebrating for each, with the result that from those two battalions over one thousand men made their Communion. It is force of circumstances which has brought men, normally accustomed to a Puritan sim-

plicity of ritual, and marked absence of ornament, to use cross and candles as they celebrated, in barn, or stable, or dug-out, that the surroundings might help to fix the minds of the worshippers on the great purpose of their presence. It was a chaplain of undoubted Protestant upbringing, and equally unquestioned Protestant principles, who fitted up a little chapel in a front-line village, with loot, or, as he called it, salvage, from the wrecked church, so that the altar glowed with a cope of crimson velvet and cloth of gold, the walls were hung with coloured plaster of Paris reliefs of the Stations of the Cross, and the reredos presented to all eyes the legend "Ite ad Joseph."

The papers on "Worship and Services" embody the most searching criticism of conventional Anglicanism, and the most interesting suggestions for reform. In France, Matins and Evensong have simply disappeared. The Eucharist has come into its rightful place as the Church's supreme act of worship, and the men have learned to love it as never before. The experience of all the chaplains has demonstrated the need of "more and fuller and wider schemes of popular devotion, that shall have a place in the Prayer Book, that can be known and loved by all from childhood; simple in language, intimate in feeling, and alight with the story and heart of our Lord; that can sink into peaceful, homely prayer, and spring into the beloved hymn effortlessly; and draw our eyes to Christ and our hearts to His Church in new and richer ways." Apparently some such devotion as this has been worked out by Father Conran, S.S.J.E., with almost miraculous results, in his "Chaplet of Prayer." Let us hope it may be incorporated in our revised Prayer Book. These chaplains tell us also that the Office of the Burial of the Dead needs drastic revision, so that it may contain among other things prayer for the departed. They had learned of only one chaplain in France who did not pray directly for the dead.

Many things in these chapters on "Worship and Services" make us rub our eyes and look once more at the names of the writers. Have we indeed lived to read such suggestions from priests of the Church of England, or are we only dreaming of something too good to be true? The Reserved Sacrament, for example, is commonly assumed as a necessity. It is said on p. 187 that our people have never learned the art of praying together, and that they never will until we adopt Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for Adoration, Benediction, and the Rosary! The Prayer Book Litany is compared unfavorably with the Roman Litany of the Sacred Heart, and we are told (p. 189) that the "reason for the unpopularity of the one is the reason for the popularity of the other." We are informed that Englishmen have now all learned to love the Crucifix, and that "the wayside Calvaries have persuaded more prayers

than all the chaplains put together." Finally these chaplains have the boldness to maintain that we shall never teach our people to worship or to receive the Holy Communion with any frequency until we teach non-communicating attendance at the Eucharist. We read on p. 206:

We want avowedly to encourage non-communicating attendance, not, maybe, for itself, but for its end. Communion then will increase in number, for no Englishman will be content with less than a whole share of sacred possessions; and they will be better communions, better understood, less timid. There is no training or teaching of the Eucharist that is full or abiding except that which can be given during and by the Eucharist itself. If attendance be encouraged, the chance of instruction is many fold increased; and with instruction and familiarity alone come to the Englishman the love of Communion, and the power to worship.

This is a book that everybody should read. It will prove more helpful to the laity than many volumes of formal religious instructions; and for the clergy it will contain suggestions for hundreds of sermons. For all who love the Church it is thus far the outstanding book of the war.